DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 237 662 CE 037 547

AUTHOR Frasier, James Robert

TITLE An Analysis of State Systems for Evaluating Handicapped and Disadvantaged Vocational Education Programs and Services.

PUB DATE 22 Mar 83

NOTE 217p.; Thesis required for Certificate of Advanced Study, University of Vermont.

PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses - Undetermined (040) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC09 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS Comparative Analysis; *Disabilities; *Disadvantaged; *Educational Assessment; Educational Quality; Evaluation Criteria; Evaluation Methods; Postsecondary Education; Program Development; Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; Program Implementation; Rural Areas; Secondary Education; Services; Special Education; *State Programs; Statewide Planning; Systems Analysis; *Vocational Education

IDENTIFIERS Regional Surveys; *Special Needs Students

ABSTRACT

A study identified strategies used in selected rural states for evaluating the effectiveness of vocational programs and services for handicapped and disadvantaged students. During the study, the researcher examined the documents used by 13 rural states to assess their vocational programs for handicapped and disadvantaged individuals. This examination consisted of a content analysis of the actual evaluation instruments and telephone interviews with individuals involved in program evaluation in each state. Based on this analysis, it appeared that the evaluation of vocational education programs for handicapped and disadvantaged students is an organized activity in most rural states, with 10 the 14 states in the study sample having evaluation programs. Nine of these states evaluated vocational programs for special needs students separately from other vocational programs. The predominate evaluation strategy used to assess these vocational programs was to have one or more external evaluators visit each program to interview students and teachers, view program facilities, and observe the program in operation. Recommendations emerging from the study included calls to specify state education agency (SEA) purposes for evaluating vocational programs and to have state program evaluation systems include a mechanism for assessing the impact of program evaluation of the SEA on local education agencies and on specific programs and services. (MN)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED237662

AN ANALYSIS OF STATE SYSTEMS FOR EVALUATING HANDICAPPED AND DISADVANTAGED VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS AND SERVICES

A Thesis Presented

by

James Robert Frasier

to

The Department of Vocational Education & Technology
and
The Department of Special Education,
Social Work, and Social Services

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
For a Certificate of Advanced Study
College of Education and Social Services

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

Submitted
March 22, 1983

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J Frasier

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CE 037547

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I have had the good fortune of receiving assistance from several individuals during preparation of this paper. First acknowledgement must go to the state consultants for handicapped and disadvantaged vocational education programs who forwarded their evaluation materials and consented to being interviewed by telephone. Without their special cooperation, this paper would not have been possible.

In addition, I would like to acknowledge the assistance of several University of Vermont faculty members who provided constructive criticism and helpful suggestions during development of the content analysis instruments: Thomas Bloom, Department of Vocational Education and Technology; Joan Buttram, Center for Evaluation and Policy Research; Raymond Coward, Department of Special Education, Social Work and Social Services, and The Center for Rural Studies; Hugh McKenzie, Department of Special Education, Social Work and Social Services; and, Herman Meyers, Center for Evaluation and Policy Research.

I especially appreciate the external critique of content analysis instruments provided by Rocco Russo, Senior Associate, Inter-America Corporation; Hollie Thomas, Professor, The Florida State University at Tallahassie; and Tim Wentling, Professor, The University of Illinois.

Appreciation is also expressed to Stuart Rosenfeld, Senior Associate, National Institute of Education, for his cooperation in providing National Institute of Education reports and other documents related to the study.

A special note of acknowledgement is extended to Walter Wimmer, Chief of Program Development, Vermont Division of Vocational and Adult Education, for his willingness to devote weekend time to the validation of the content analysis instruments.

Finally, I wish to express my most sincere gratitude to Leonard Albright for his unlimited patience and guidance as my thesis advisor. I will always be professionally indebted to him for his encouragement, criticism and cooperation throughout the development, implementation and writing of this study.

James R. Frasier

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION 1

Background 1
Statement of the Problem 4
Purpose of the Study 5
Major Questions of the Study 6
Limitations of the Study 7
Definition of Terms 9

II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE 12

H/D Program Evaluation Practices 12
General SEA Program Evaluation Practices . 13
The Abt Study 14
The Wentling Study 16

III. METHODS AND PROCEDURES 18

Sample 18
Collection of H/D Evaluation Documents . . 19
Design of Instruments 20
Validation of Instruments 22
Analysis of H/D Evaluation Documents . . . 24
Establishing Inter-rater Reliability . . . 25
Telephone Interviews 26

IV. RESULTS 29

1. Results of the Content Analysis 32

Planning and Operational Processes . . 32
Evaluation Designs 34
Evaluation Strategies 37

2. Results of Telephone Interviews For States With Formally Structured Evaluation Systems 39

3. Results of Telephone Interviews For States Without Formally Structured Evaluation Instruments Or Procedures 47

V. CONCLUSIONS 49

VI. DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS 52

VII. REFERENCE NOTES 57

VIII. REFERENCES 58

IX. APPENDICES 62

- Appendix A 62
- Appendix B 64
- Appendix C 66
- Appendix D 68
- Appendix E 115
- Appendix F 128
- Appendix G 139
- Appendix H 141
- Appendix I 143
- Appendix J 145

TABLES

Sample States H/D Program Evaluation Activity . . . 30

Presence of SEA Evaluative Activity By Category of Analysis Indicators 33

H/D Consultant Opinions About the Purposes for Evaluating H/D Programs 41

Consultant Ratings of How Well Their System Can Assess H/D Program Planning and Operational Processes 43

How H/D Consultants Use Program Evaluation Results . 46

I. INTRODUCTION

Background

The Vocational Education Act of 1963 (PL 88-210) encouraged states to develop vocational programs and services for unemployed youth, the socially disadvantaged, and the handicapped (Barlow, 1976; Williams, 1971). How well local education agencies (LEA's) implemented programs and services to meet the vocational training needs of these populations was to be determined by periodic state-level evaluations and evaluation findings reported to Congress by the National Advisory Council on Vocational Education in 1968 (PL 88-210).

After reviewing findings of the Advisory Council on Vocational Education's Report (Essex, 1968), which questioned whether vocational programs had served special needs populations, Congress required states in the 1968 Vocational Education Act Amendments to use specific percentages of federal funds for handicapped and disadvantaged programs and prescribed new vocational education program evaluation requirements (PL 90-576).

However, as noted by the General Accounting Office (1974), Lee (1971) and Wentling (1980), evaluation requirements mandated in the 1968 Amendments were a source of confusion for many states: areas of state evaluation responsibility remained unclear; federal evaluation requirements remained vague; and a clear definition of evaluation and evaluation procedures was lacking in the legislation.

In preparation for the 1976 Hearings on Reauthorization of the 1968 Amendments, the U.S. Office of Education contracted with the Olympus Research Corporation to conduct a national assessment of vocational education programs for the handicapped and disadvantaged. Summarizing the general state of monitoring and evaluation of vocational education programs for the handicapped, the Olympus Research Corporation Report (1974) stated:

> Actual enrollment figures were not available, and in most states there was little information on completers, dropouts, and placements. Follow-up data were not available in any state. (p.206)

The Olympus Research Corporation's Report (1976) on the status of vocational education for disadvantaged populations also found actual enrollment figures were unavailable and observed program evaluation at state education agency (SEA) and LEA levels was unsystematic and inadequate:

> Considering the informality of the planning process, it should come as no surprise that the monitoring and evaluation of programs for the disadvantaged was equally as informal at both the state and local levels. (p.161)

In response to this continued lack of information about the impact of vocational education and the confusion of many states over federal evaluation requirements, Congress prescribed at least 28 specific requirements related to federal, state, and local program evaluation activity in the 1976 Vocational Education Act Amendments (Wentling, 1980). Focusing on program evaluation by the states, the 1976 Vocational Education Act Amendments (PL 94-482) identified systematic program evaluation as a responsibility of the SEA (Federal Rules and Regulations, October 3, 1977):

> The State Board shall, during the five-year period of the State Plan, evaluate in quantitative terms the effectiveness of each formally organized program or project supported by Federal, state, and local funds. These evaluations shall be in terms of:
>
> a) planning and operational processes;
>
> b) results of student achievement;
>
> c) results of student employment success; and,
>
> d) results of additional services, as measured by a, b, and c of this section that the state provides to special populations. (pp.53842-3)

Although some states had evaluation systems in operation that needed only minor changes to comply with the 1976 mandates, most states had to develop entirely new evaluation systems capable of systematically evaluating all vocational programs (Smith & Holt, 1979, 1980; Wentling & Russo, 1978). Consequently most SEA's were faced with the common problem of developing, implementing and/or revising their respective evaluation systems with only a limited knowledge base available from other states.

Statement of the Problem

Vermont, like many other states, did not have a system for evaluating special needs programs and services as mandated in the 1976 Amendments. In an effort to comply with the evaluation mandates, the Vermont Division of Vocational Education recently contracted with the University of Vermont to develop a statewide system for the evaluation of handicapped and disadvantaged (H/D) programs.

One of the first activities undertaken by the University's project staff was to search for information about strategies used by other states to evaluate H/D programs and services. Perhaps, other states had successfully used a particular evaluation strategy and/or had encountered problems with an evaluation strategy that could have provided valuable data for the project staff to consider in designing a Vermont system. However, an ERIC search of literature and telephone contacts with several individuals knowledgable about vocational program evaluation yielded only limited information about other states evaluation strategies.

Confronted with this lack of data, the University's project staff was presented with the problem of how to obtain information about the types of strategies used by other states to evaluate H/D programs that could be useful in designing a H/D program evaluation for the Vermont Division of Vocational Education.

Purpose of the Study

The overall purpose of the study was to identify strategies used in selected states for evaluating the effectiveness of H/D vocational education programs and services as required by the 1976 Vocational Education Act Amendments.

More specifically, the two central objectives of the study were:

(1) To identify the types of evaluation strategies presently being used by rural states in

assessing the planning and operational processes of vocational education programs and services for handicapped and disadvantaged persons; and,

2. To make information gained from the study available for use in designing a statewide system for evaluating handicapped and disadvantaged vocational education programs in Vermont.

Major Questions of the Study

The 1976 Amendments clearly emphasized the role of the individual states in the overall evaluation of programs. In order to gain a more complete understanding of how each state had responded to the evaluation mandates, the study sought to answer two major questions:

(1) What types of evaluation strategies were being used by rural states to assess the planning and operational processes of programs and services designed for handicapped and disadvantaged students enrolled in vocational education programs?

(2) Were handicapped and disadvantaged programs and services evaluated as a part of, or separate from, rural states on-going systems for

evaluating all vocational education programs within the period of their five year plans?

Limitations of the Study

Initially, the University's project staff was interested in securing information about the types of strategies used by SEA's to evaluate H/D programs and services in terms of program planning and operational processes, results of student achievement, and results of student employment success as required by the 1976 Amendments. However, an analysis of Vermont's Quality Assessment System (QAS) For Evaluating Vocational Education Programs revealed information within the QAS could be adapted for determining results of H/D student achievement and results of student employment success (Frasier & Albright, Note 1). Based on this analysis, the Vermont Division of Vocational Education and the University's project staff decided to emphasize program planning and operational processes in the design of a H/D program evaluation system for Vermont. Therefore, to provide the project staff with information for use during development and refinement of a Vermont H/D program evaluation system, the study was limited to identifying SEA evaluation strategies for assessing program planning and operational processes.

As the project staff was concerned with development of a SEA-level H/D program evaluation system, only SEA personnel were interviewed by telephone. Due to budgetary constraints and time lines imposed by an immediate need for information during design of a Vermont H/D program evaluation system, contact with persons knowledgable about sample states evaluation practices was limited to a single telephone interview with each SEA's consultant for H/D programs. No attempt was made to include LEA personnel.

DEFINITION OF TERMS

Handicapped - "A person who is mentally retarded, hard of hearing, deaf, speech impaired, visually handicapped, seriously emotionally disturbed, orthopedically impaired, or other health impaired, or a person with learning disabilities, and who by reason of this handicap requires special education and related services in order to succeed in a regular vocational program and/or requires a modified vocational education program" (Federal Register, October 3, 1977:53864).

Disadvantaged - "Persons (other than handicapped persons) who have academic or economic disadvantages and require special services, assistance, or programs in order to enable them to succeed in vocational education programs" (Federal Register, October 3, 1977).

> Academic Disadvantaged ...means that a person: lacks reading and writing skills; lacks mathematical skills; or performs below grade level. (p. 53864)
>
> Economic Disadvantaged ...means: family income is at or below national poverty level; participant or parent(s) or guardian of the participant is unemployed; participant or parent of participant is recipient of public assistance; or participant is institutionalized or under State guardianship" (p. 53864)

Evaluation - "Evaluation is the process of delineating, obtaining, and applying descriptive and judgemental information; concerning some objects merit; as revealed by its goals design, implementation, and results; and for purposes of decision making and accountability." (Stufflebeam, 1976)

Rural States - States that, according to the 1970 Census, have more than 50 percent of their population living neither in central cities nor in suburban areas (Bryan, 1981).

Planning and Operational Processes - These terms will include questions developed to identify program planning and operational processes in H/D evaluation documents (as listed in Appendix G); AND, program planning and operational processes such as:

(1) Quality and availability of instructional offerings;
(2) Guidance, counseling, and placement and follow-up services;
(3) Capacity and condition of facilities and equipment;
(4) Employer participation in cooperative programs vocational education;
5) Teacher/pupil ratios; and,
(6) Teacher qualifications (Federal Register, October 3, 1977:53842).

Special Needs Populations - Special needs populations are:

(1) Women;
(2) Members of minority groups;
(3) Handicapped persons;
(4) Disadvantaged persons; and
(5) Persons of limited English-speaking ability.
(Federal Register, October 3, 1977:53843)

II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

A review of literature relevant to SEA evaluation practices in vocational education was conducted for the purpose of examining how states have implemented the evaluation of H/D vocational education programs as prescribed by the 1976 Vocational Education Act Amendments. The literature search was implemented in two stages: First, a search limited to state H/D program evaluation practices; and, second, an expanded search that involved all state-level vocational education program evaluation practices.

H/D Program Evaluation Practices

An ERIC search of literature in August 1981 specifically related to SEA evaluation of H/D vocational education programs since the 1976 Amendments, and an expanded ERIC search of literature in January 1982 related to SEA evaluation of vocational special needs programs, disclosed only one related article by Wentling and Russo (1978). This scarcity of information about vocational special needs program evaluation was also noted in a rece[illegible] review of SEA special needs program evaluation practices by Phelps (1980) and in a recent review of literature on the evaluation of vocational education programs and services for Limited English-Speaking populations by Thomas and Margos (1982). Smith (1982) identified a similar lack of writing in the professional literature on the evaluation practices used by SEA's to conduct general education program evaluation.

General SEA Program Evaluation Practices

A general survey of literature related to SEA evaluation of vocational education programs since the 1976 Amendments identified a series of three studies contracted by the National Institute For Education to determine the progress of states in implementing the evaluation requirements of the 1976 Amendments: the Contract Research Corporation national survey on the status of evaluation activity across the states (Smith & Holt, 1979, 1980); the Abt Associates study of the extent to which the states had implemented various provisions of the 1976 Amendments (Beuke, Lukas, Brigham, Glick & Breen, 1980); and, the Wentling national survey of State Directors For Vocational Education to determine the extent to which program evaluation requirements had been implemented in their respective states (Wentling, 1981; Wentling & Barnard, 1982). However, of these three studies, only the Abt and Wentling studies provided information about the extent to which SEA's had evaluated the results of additional services for special needs populations.

Highlights of the Abt and Wentling Studies

The Abt Study - The major emphasis of the Abt Study (Beuke et al., 1980) was to determine the extent to which 15 sample states had implemented provisions of the 1976 Amendments related to: program improvement; educational equity; and the distribution of federal funds. States were selected to ensure: geographical representation based on the four census regions; percent of the total potential vocational student population; and type of vocational governance structure used by the state to administer the 1976 Amendments. Data from state and local levels were collected during the 1979-80 school year by combining case study and survey methodologies. Interview data were supplemented by an analysis of documents collected in each of the 15 states surveyed.

Findings of the Abt Study (Beuke et al., 1980) related to the evaluation of special needs programs and services disclosed:

- Very little attention had been given to evaluating the results of additional programs and services for special needs populations.

- All sample states which had a formal program review process included some items on special needs populations, but the extent of attention given by states to the evaluation of special needs populations programs and services varied considerably.

- The primary emphasis of SEA evaluations related to special needs populations had been on access to vocational programs and services.

- Evaluation of special populations' achievement and employment success had not been conducted by SEA's in the 15 states surveyed.

- There appeared to be, among those states that gave a more extensive evaluation, a widely used evaluation strategy format of sequenced self-study by the local school district, external review by a team of individuals, and development of a local improvement plan based on the results of the external team review.

The Wentling Study - The major purpose of the Wentling Study (Wentling, 1981; Wentling & Barnard, 1982) was to determine the opinion of State Directors For Vocational Education concerning: 1) the extent to which the evaluation requirements of the 1976 Amendments had been implemented in their respective states and territories; and 2) how they perceived the effectiveness and utility of vocational program evaluation. A survey questionnaire, mailed to the state directors with a cover letter signed by the Executive Director of the National Association of State Directors of Vocational Education, was the data collection method used in this study. The response rate was 88%.

A review of findings in the Wentling Study (Wentling, 1981; Wentling & Barnard, 1982) related to evaluation of special needs populations programs and services revealed:

- By the spring of 1981, the evaluation of programs and services for special populations was not yet fully implemented in 29 states.

- Very little had been done to evaluate the results of programs and services to special populations.

- A total of 36 state directors indicated they would continue to evaluate programs and services for special populations even if federal evaluation requirements were eliminated.

However, a major limitation of the Abt and Wentling studies was the aggregation of data under the generic category of "special needs populations". Neither study delineated state evaluation activities for each special need population group. Consequently, specific information related to how states evaluated handicapped and disadvantaged programs was lacking in both studies.

III. METHODS AND PROCEDURES

The analyses in the study were based on handicapped and disadvantaged program evaluation materials received from sample states and from telephone interviews conducted with H/D consultants following a review of each state's evaluation documents. Methods and procedures for selecting sample states, collecting and analyzing SEA evaluation documents, and conducting telephone interviews are described in this section.

Sample

Nineteen rural states (as identified by Bryan, 1981) formed the target population of the study. A stratified single-stage sampling method adapted from Moser & Kalton (1972) was used to assure an even geographic spread of selected states.

Target states were alphabetically ordered, numbered 1 through 19, and divided into four groups according to the four census regions: Northeast, North Central, South and West (U.S. Bureau of the Census). The regional grouping of these target states is shown in Appendix A.

As the Northeast Region had only three states and Vermont was excluded from the selection process, two states were selected from this group. A table of random numbers was used to identify four states in each group until a total of 14 states were selected as the sample.

Collection of H/D Evaluation Documents

A telephone request to individuals in SEA's responsible for H/D vocational education programs (H/D consultants) was the primary method used to obtain evaluation documents.* A personal letter (shown in Appendix B) was sent to each state H/D consultant within two days following the first telephone contact. The letter, adapted from Erdos (1970), reiterated the purposes of the study, identified the H/D documents requested, and expressed appreciation for the individual's anticipated cooperation.

---

*Note: Two U.S. Office of Education Directories were used to identify H/D consultants of sample states: (1) The 1981 Directory of State Officials with Responsibilities for Vocational Education of Disadvantaged Youth; and, (2) The 1981 Directory of State Personnel Responsible for Vocational Education of Handicapped Persons.

If state evaluation documents were not received within 15 working days after the initial telephone request, a follow-up telephone contact was made to inquire whether the requested documents had been sent. A third and final telephone inquiry was made when the documents were not received within 30 working days after the initial telephone request.

Design of Instruments

Two categories of content analysis, the evaluation of program planning and the evaluation of program operational processes, were used in the study. Conceptually, these categories directly corresponded to two types of evaluation within the CIPP Evaluation Model (Stufflebeam, Foley, Gephart, Guba, Hammond, Merriman & Provus, 1971): evaluation of program planning processes with C - Context Evaluation; and evaluation of program operational processes with P - Process Evaluation.

> Context Evaluation provides information for planning decisions by describing actual conditions, determining unmet needs and unused opportunities, and provides general information for determination of program goals. (p. 218)
>
> Process Evaluation provides information for implementing features of the program, potential sources of program failure, and provides general information for determination of program improvement. (p. 229)

Questions for identifying the evaluation of H/D program planning and operational processes were formulated by a two-step process adapted from Stufflebeam's (1976) framework for designing evaluation studies:

> Step 1. General questions were delineated for evaluation of program planning (Context Evaluation) and program operational processes (Process Evaluation).
>
> Step 2. Specific questions for identifying the evaluation of H/D program planning processes and program operational processes were formulated from the general questions developed in Step #1.

A similar two-step process was also suggested by Wentling (1980) for use in developing questions to evaluate the effectiveness of occupational education and training programs.

The format of "IF YES-then" questions was adapted from Stufflebeam's et al. (1971) contingency mode of context evaluation. These questions, written to reflect the meaning of each program planning and operational process question within the content analysis instruments, were formulated to probe for types of: a) evaluation designs used to implement H/D program evaluations; b) strategies used to "verify how" a program's planning and operational processes were being evaluated; and, c) strategies used to "verify the effectiveness" of a program's planning and operational processes.

Possible strategy types commonly used in evaluation were listed under each "IF YES-then" question to facilitate ease of recording information and to maintain continuity within each category of analysis. The formating of strategy types under each question is shown in Appendix C.

Validation of Instruments

Internal and external review procedures adapted from Sanders and Cunningham (1973) were used in the development of the content analysis instruments to maximize the potential of questions for identifying H/D program planning and operational processes.

Two internal reviews of the content analysis instruments were conducted by selected faculty members at the University of Vermont. The first internal review was done by three individuals who were selected for their prior work with handicapped and disadvantaged programs and/or experience with rural educational programs. The second internal review was carried out by another two individuals selected for their expertise in evaluation of educational programs.

An external review was conducted by an independent panel of three experts. Experts were selected who had previously adapted the CIPP Model's (Stufflebeam et al., 1971) conceptual framework for designing vocational education evaluation systems, and/or who had specialized in designing evaluation systems for vocational special needs programs.

Throughout the internal and external review process, each person was given the same set of instructions for reviewing the content analysis instruments. Individuals were requested to critically review and comment on the appropriateness of: a) each content analysis question for identifying H/D program planning and operational processes and to offer additional questions that could be used to identify such processes; and, b) the "IF YES - then" question format for identifying types of SEA evaluation strategies. A sequential record of internal and external reviewer suggestions and the action taken in response to each reviewer's comments is presented in Appendix D.

The content analysis instruments used in the study are shown in Appendix E (planning processes) and in Appendix F (operational processes).

Analysis of H/D Evaluation Documents

States H/D evaluation documents were analyzed using a method of qualitative analysis for determining the presence of particular content (Berelson, 1971). The procedures employed are described in sequence below:

1. Before starting the analysis of a state's documents, the evaluation materials were read by the investigator in order to gain an appreciation for the organization, content and implementation procedures of the state's evaluation system.

2. Each state's documents were first analyzed for evaluative questions (hereafter referred to as indicators) indicating SEA efforts to evaluate program planning processes and, then, for SEA efforts to evaluate program operational processes.

3. To simplify use of the Planning and Operational Content Analysis Instruments, the presence/absence of each category's indicators (as suggested by Wentling, Note 2) were recorded on Code Sheets as shown in Appendix G.

4. After completion of the content analyses, the marked code sheet indicators triggered the selection of appropriate Content Analysis Instrument Indicator Sheets (Appendix H) within the content analysis instruments.

5. Evaluation strategy types were identified for each category of analysis indicator and recorded on the appropriate Content Analysis Indicator Sheets.

When the content analysis of all states were completed, a two-step analysis of data was conducted. First: State Category of Analysis Indicator Sheets were sorted by number. Second: The types of evaluation strategies used by each state, as marked under "IF YES - then" questions, were compiled in descriptive form.

Establishing Inter-rater Reliability

Inter-rater reliability was established through adaptation of a method suggested by Thomas (Note 3) for determining agreement between individuals using content analysis instruments.

Before a sample state's documents were analyzed, a non-involved state's H/D evaluation documents were jointly analyzed by an independent rater and the investigator. Throughout this joint analysis, each rater helped to train the other by: openly sharing information; discussing use of the instruments; clarifying the intent of questions; discussing and resolving differences; and noting reasons for similar judgements.

Following the joint analysis, the investigator worked alone to conduct a state-by-state content analysis of H/D evaluation documents. After the investigator had completed the analysis of documents from all sample states, the independent rater randomly selected and analyzed two state's evaluation documents. The number of agreements between raters divided by the number of agreements plus the number of disagreements were calculated to give the percentage score of inter-rater reliability for each content analysis instrument.

Telephone Interviews

H/D consultants of sample states were interviewed by phone after the content analysis of documents had been completed. Individuals interviewed were those who had been previously contacted for information about their respective state's evaluation of H/D vocational programs. Before each interview began, the purposes of the study were reiterated, questions related to the study answered, and verbal assurance was given to the person interviewed that individual and state names would not be identified in reporting of the study.

The telephone interviews with individuals whose states did not have formally structured H/D program evaluation instruments or procedures were very limited (Appendix I). The questions asked were merely intended to: (1) verify the state's lack of a formally structured H/D program evaluation system; (2) inquire whether H/D programs were evaluated as part of, or separate from, the state's on-going system for evaluating all vocational education programs within the period of the five year plan; and, (3) ask about plans the state might have had regarding the evaluation of H/D programs and services.

A more extensive telephone interview instrument was developed for states with formally structured H/D program evaluation instruments and procedures. The first part of the interview was intended to: (1) verify how the documents received were currently being used (e.g. under revision, no longer in use); (2) inquire whether H/D programs were evaluated as part of, or separate from, the state's on-going system for evaluating all vocational education programs within the period of the five year plan; and, (3) if necessary, clarify items about the state's H/D evaluation system that had resulted from the content analysis of SEA evaluation documents. The second part involved a set of questions (Appendix J) that was intended to probe for the opinion of H/D consultants concerning: a) purposes for evaluating special needs programs; b) utility of their respective state's evaluation instruments and procedures for determining the effectiveness of H/D program planning and operational processes; c) "use" of evaluation results by the SEA and local education agencies; and d) difficulties encountered in developing and in implementing their respective state's H/D evaluation instruments and procedures.

Telephone interview data were tabulated in descriptive form, state by state, and used to supplement each state's document analysis.

IV. RESULTS

The telephone request to sample states for H/D program evaluation documents resulted in the receipt of materials from 13 of 14 states.

Four categories of program evaluation activity were initially identified in the documents reviewed from sample states: (1) states with separate, formally structured, H/D program evaluation instruments and procedures; (2) states with formally structured H/D program evaluation instruments and procedures integrated into their total vocational education program evaluation system; (3) states conducting H/D program evaluation, but without formally structured instruments or procedures; and, (4) states not evaluating H/D vocational education programs. However, a fifth category of SEA program evaluation activity was added as a result of telephone interviews with the state H/D consultants. This fifth category consisted of states in the process of developing a H/D program evaluation system. These five categories of SEA evaluation activity are listed in Table 1.

Table 1

Sample States H/D
Program Evaluation Activity

Category	Number of States
States with separate, formalized, H/D program evaluation systems	4
States with formalized H/D program evaluation integrated into the 5 year state evaluation system	1
States conducting H/D program evaluation but without a formalized system	5
States in the process of developing a H/D program evaluation system	3
States not conducting H/D program evaluation	1
Total states	14

To facilitate clarity in the reporting of data analysis findings, the four states with separate, formally structured, H/D program evaluation instruments and procedures and the one state with H/D program evaluation instruments and procedures "integrated" into the total SEA vocational program evaluation system were combined into a single category entitled, "SEA's with formally structured H/D program evaluation systems. In order to maintain the anonymity of these five states and sustain continuity in reporting results of the study, each state was arbitrarily assigned a number from 1 to 5.

Findings reported in this section have been ordered to reflect: (1) the results of document analyses for states with formally structured H/D program evaluation systems; (2) the results of H/D consultant telephone interviews for states with formally structured H/D program evaluation systems; and, (3) the results of H/D consultant telephone interviews for states conducting evaluation, but without formally structured H/D program evaluation instruments or procedures.

1. Results of the Content Analyses

A. Program Planning and Operational Processes

A content analysis of materials received from five sample states with formally structured H/D program evaluation systems revealed each state's documents had evaluative questions for assessing program planning and operational processes. This finding was affirmed by inter-rater reliability scores of 88 percent, using the Content Analysis Instruments for Identifying Program Planning Processes, and of 85 percent, using the Content Analysis Instruments for Identifying Program Operational Processes.

The presence of states evaluative questions for assessing program planning and operational processes are identified by category of analysis indicators in Table 2. In terms of program planning processes, the three most commonly used indicators identified:

- whether the unmet needs of an individual student influenced the student's program goals and objectives;
- whether the individuals knowledgable about the needs of H/D students were involved in planning that

Table 2

Presence of SEA Evaluative Activity
by Category of Analysis Indicators

Indicators of Program Planning Processes	Presence by state				
	S#1	S#2	S#3	S#4	S#5
1. Does the SEA evaluate whether the LEA has made efforts to identify locally available handicapped/disadvantaged resources and/or services?					
2. Does the SEA evaluate efforts made by the LEA to utilize locally available handicapped/disadvantaged resources and or services?		X			X
3. Does the SEA evaluate efforts made by the LEA to identify those students in need of special services or programs in order to succeed in their vocational education program?			X		X
4. Does the SEA evaluate whether the LEA handicapped/disadvantaged program is serving only those students who are unable to succeed in their vocational education program?	X		X		X
5. Does the SEA evaluate whether the LEA Program assesses the unmet needs of each individual program participant prior to providing services?					X
6. Does the SEA evaluate whether individuals knowledgeable about the student (e.g. parents, teachers, special educators) are involved in assessment activities that seek to identify the student's unmet needs prior to the program providing services?			X		X
7. Does the SEA evaluate whether the unmet needs of an individual student influence the student's program goals and objectives as a participant in the handicapped/disadvantaged program?	X	X	X	X	[illegible]
8. Does the SEA evaluate whether the unmet needs of individual students influence the formation of the LEA program's goals and objectives?					
9. Does the SEA evaluate whether the student's vocational instructor is involved in the planning which develops goals and objectives for meeting the student's unmet needs?		X			X
10. Does the SEA evaluate whether individuals knowledgeable about the needs of handicapped/disadvantaged students (e.g. handicapped/disadvantaged workers, advisory committee members) are involved in the planning that influences the formation of the LEA program's goals and objectives?	X	X	X	X	
11. Does the SEA evaluate whether the LEA has established timelines for completing major program goals and objectives?					
12. Does the SEA evaluate whether the LEA has a plan for implementing the program's goals and objectives?					

Indicators of Program Operational Processes	Presence by state				
	S#1	S#2	S#3	S#4	S#5
1. Does the SEA evaluate whether LEA program goals and objectives have been implemented as planned?			X		
2. Does the SEA evaluate whether people involved in and/or affected by the program are aware of the program's purpose(s)?		X			
3. Does the SEA evaluate whether people involved in and/or affected by the program are aware of the services provided by the program?		X			
4. Does the SEA evaluate whether people involved in and/or affected by the program are in agreement with the adequacy of instructional resources available for use by the participants?	X	X	X	X	X
5. Does the SEA evaluate whether the goals and objectives planned to help the student succeed in a vocational program have been implemented by the program as planned?					
6. Does the SEA evaluate whether the vocational instructor has participated in the implementation of program goals & objectives planned to help the student succeed in a vocational program?					
7. Does the SEA evaluate whether the program is having an effect on the participant's performance in his/her vocational education program?			X		
8. Does the SEA evaluate whether people involved in and/or affected by the program believe the instructional offerings available are appropriately matched with identified student unmet needs?			X		
9. Does the SEA evaluate whether the program has an appropriate teacher/pupil ratio?			X		
10. Does the SEA evaluate whether the program's instructor(s) has the teacher qualifications to work with handicapped/disadvantaged students?	X		X	X	

Note. S = State

influenced formulation of the LEA program's goals and objectives; and,

- whether the local H/D program was serving only those students who were unable to succeed in their regular vocational education program.

In terms of program operational processes, the two most commonly used indicators identified:

- whether people involved in and/or affected by a H/D program were in agreement with the adequacy of instructional resources available for use by the participants; and,
- whether a program instructor(s) had the necessary teacher qualifications to work with handicapped and/or disadvantaged students.

B. Program Evaluation Designs

Through the content analysis of H/D evaluation documents, two groups of H/D program evaluation designs were identified: centralized and decentralized. States with centralized evaluation designs had direct, on-site, SEA involvement during evaluation activities and the final program evaluation report was written by the SEA. Conversely, states with decentralized evaluation designs minimized direct SEA involvement during evaluation activities and the SEA did not write the final program evaluation report.

The evaluation designs of states #1 and #3 were centralized. In both states, the program teacher was responsible for conducting a self-evaluation using SEA prescribed instruments. Findings from the self-evaluation were then verified by the H/D consultant during an on-site verification team visit held to confirm all vocational teacher self-evaluations. The final program evaluation report was written by the H/D consultant using findings of the on-site verification visit.

States #2 and #4 had decentralized evaluation designs. In each of these states, a local evaluation team (its composition based on SEA guidelines) was responsible for conducting an evaluation of the program using SEA prescribed instruments. Following the evaluation, a member of the local team wrote the final program evaluation report and submitted it to the H/D consultant.

The evaluation design of state #5 was centralized, but a mixture of SEA and LEA directed program evaluation activities. In this state, an inter-disciplinary, self-study evaluation committee selected by the LEA (its composition based on SEA guidelines) was responsible for conducting a school-wide evaluation of all supportive services provided to vocational special needs students. After completion of this study, an SEA appointed external evaluation team, using the same type of SEA evaluation instrument as used by the LEA, conducted an evaluation of the school's supportive services to special needs students. However, the final evaluation report was written by the state consultant for vocational special needs using: (a) the results of the LEA self-study; (b) the vocational special needs external evaluation team's findings; and (c) the reports of two other external evaluation teams that had assessed regular vocational programs and the school's compliance with state and federal vocational education laws.

The analysis of state's H/D program evaluation designs revealed each of the five sample states with formally structured H/D program evaluation systems:

- utilized SEA designated Likert-type scales to quantitatively record the extent of program planning and operational processes;
- used the same evaluation design for assessing the effectiveness of program planning processes as it used for assessing the effectiveness of program operational processes; and,

- employed the same evaluation design to evaluate H/D programs as it used to evaluate other vocational education programs.

C. Program Evaluation Strategies

Evaluation strategies in four of five states involved the use of an external individual(s) in the evaluative process. In the one state not involving an external evaluator(s), the evaluative strategy was to survey individuals involved in and/or affected by all vocational programs.

The four external evaluation strategies identified to assess the effectiveness of H/D program planning and operational processes were:

1. The H/D consultant (state #1). The consultant conducted an on-site visit to view the program in operation, talk with the program's students and instructor, and review program and student records. Based on this visit, the consultant verified the program instructor's self-evaluation of program effectiveness.

2. A special needs "expert" appointed by the H/D consultant (state #3). The expert was appointed from a group of individuals selected and trained by the H/D consultant. The consultant or expert conducted an on-site visit to view the program in operation, talk with the instructor, and review program and student records. Based on this visit, the evaluator verified the program instructor's self-evaluation of the program's effectiveness.

3. An LEA appointed team of individuals, its composition prescribed by the SEA, employed in vocations not directly related to education (state #4). Usually, this team has been composed of local H/D program advisory committee members. An evening meeting of team members was held to discuss SEA formulated questions about the program and to rate the program's effectiveness.

4. An SEA appointed team of special needs experts from outside the LEA (state #5). Experts from other school districts - persons employed as vocational special needs instructors or in occupations related to the education of handicapped and/or disadvantaged individuals - conducted an on-site visit,

interviewed students and the program staff, viewed the program in operation, and reviewed program and student records. Based on this visit, the team members evaluated the program's effectiveness using a SEA developed instrument.

In the one state not involving an external evaluator (state #2), the LEA conducted an opinion survey (its composition determined by the SEA) of individuals involved in and/or affected by vocational education programs. Four groups of individuals (randomly selected by SEA prescribed percentages) were surveyed: parents, students, school professional staff and advisory committee members. Instruments were individualized for each survey group and contained questions related to the effectiveness of all vocational education programs. Individual responses were tabulated, recorded as group mean scores and reported on an SEA prescribed form.

2. Telephone Interview Results For States With Formally Structured Evaluation Systems

The H/D consultant telephone interviews for states with formally structured H/D program evaluation systems revealed a generally positive opinion about the purposes, effectiveness, utility, and value of their respective state's H/D program evaluation system.

When asked whether H/D programs were evaluated as part of, or separate from, their state's on-going system for evaluating all vocational education programs within the period of their SEA's Five Year Plan, consultants in four states (states #1, #3, #4, and #5) answered they evaluated H/D programs as a separate activity and with separate instruments. The consultant of state #2 responded H/D program evaluation was included within - was part of - the SEA's evaluation instrument used for evaluating all vocational education programs. All consultants indicated H/D program evaluation was conducted at the same time as the SEA was evaluating all other vocational education programs as required in the 1976 Amendments.

In response to the question: "What are the purposes for evaluating H/D programs and services in your state?", all consultants stated it was to provide information for program improvement. Thirteen additional purposes related to program planning and operational processes were also identified by consultants. These purposes are listed in Table 3.

On a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being the highest, consultants assigned a number value of 3 or 4 when asked how well their state's H/D evaluation system was able to

Table 3

H/D Consultants Opinions About the Purposes for Evaluating H/D Programs

Purposes	Consultant opinions by state				
	S#1	S#2	S#3	S#4	S#5
To determine whether the LEA program is serving H/D students	X				X
To determine whether the LEA is doing what it said it would do to meet the needs of H/D students (e.g. meeting objectives stated in the funding proposal	X				
To provide information for program improvement	X	X	X	X	X
To evaluate program planning processes	X				
To identify student progress		X			
To identify teaching management problems		X			
To identify inservice needs of H/D instructors		X			
To gain information of what is actually happening in H/D programs for informing the state legislature and parent groups		X			
To be accountable for use of federal funds		X			
To determine whether the program is providing quality level services to H/D students			X		
To determine whether services are being provided to H/D students in a non-threatening environment			X		
To meet federal evaluation requirements				X	
To help the LEA determine local H/D program needs					X
To determine what the H/D program is doing					X

Note. S = state

determine the effectiveness of local program planning processes. When asked to rate their system's ability to determine the effectiveness of local program operational processes, consultants of states with an on-site, SEA appointed, evaluation team component assigned a numerical value of 4.5 and 5, while consultants of states without an on-site, SEA appointed, evaluation team component rated their system's effectiveness as 1 and 2.5. Consultant ratings are graphically illustrated in Table 4.

When asked whether their state had encountered any difficulties during development of its H/D program evaluation system, all consultants responded they were unaware of any particular problems or were not employed by the SEA at the time the system was developed. However, two consultants mentioned they had encountered difficulties during the implementation of their state's H/D program evaluation system. The consultant of state #1 disclosed the state's H/D program evaluation system did not readily apply to all H/D programs and that more than one system was needed for evaluation of H/D programs and services. The consultant of state #2 outlined three difficulties encountered by the SEA in using its survey instruments: (1) the LEA's found it time consuming to administer, collect and tabulate the questionnaires; (2) the LEA's needed more

Table 4

Consultant Ratings of How Well Their System Can
Assess H/D Program Planning and Operational Processes

Type of Process	Consultant ratings by state				
	S#1	S#2	S#3	S#4	S#5
Program planning processes	4	4	3	4	4
Program operational processes	4.5	2.5	5	1	5

Note. S = State

Ratings are on a scale of 1 to 5 with
5 being the highest.

help from the consultant to interpret survey results than SEA time and travel funds could provide; and, (3) the questions in the surveys were too complex or too technical for some respondents.

With the exception of one state's difficulty in using its survey instruments, all consultants expressed a belief that reaction of local personnel to their state's evaluation of H/D programs had been good to excellent. When asked the question: "How do you as a state consultant think the local level vocational educators use results of H/D program evaluations?", the following responses were received:

> "They take it to heart and 90% of the LEA's implement recommendations. We know this because our State Advisory Council for Vocational Education did an evaluation of how LEA's perceived our H/D evaluation system." (state #1)
>
> "They take the evaluation seriously. It has resulted in people from the community becoming involved in planning processes and using program advisory committee members. It gives a real purpose to advisory committee meetings." (state #2)
>
> "Yes and No. If they like the evaluation, they seem to keep the program. If not, they drop it and make a new application for another handicapped or disadvantaged program. They don't seem to like improving on what they have." (state #3)

> "They attempt to implement recommendations because it is their own local people making recommendations, not the state." (state #4)

> "The LEA's implement them. If they don't we don't fund the program again." (state #5)

In response to the question: "How do you as a state consultant use results of H/D program evaluations?", all consultants reported using results for monitoring whether program evaluation recommendations had been implemented by the LEA. Consultants of states with centralized evaluation designs indicated using program evaluation findings to make recommendations for program improvement and, when visiting H/D programs, to determine whether these recommendations had been implemented. Similarly, the consultants of states with decentralized evaluation designs, when visiting H/D programs, mentioned using results for determining whether the LEA had implemented recommendations made by the locally appointed program evaluation team. The specific responses of consultants are listed in Table 5.

Table 5

Reported Use of
Program Evaluation Results

Results Reported by Consultants	S#1	S#2	S#3	S#4	S#5
To make recommendations for program improvement	X		X		X
To see if recommendations for program improvement have been implemented when visiting the H/D program	X		X		X
To see if local recommendations made by the locally appointed evaluation team have been implemented when visiting the H/D program		X		X	
To develop a state plan of action for working with the LEA		X			
To determine whether the program will be refunded		X			
To design inservice programs for H/D instructors		X			

Note. S = State

3. Telephone Interview Results For States Conducting Evaluations But Without Formally Structured Evaluation Instruments or Procedures

The H/D consultant telephone interviews for states conducting H/D program evaluations, but without formally structured evaluation instruments or procedures, disclosed each of these states evaluated H/D programs: (1) at the same time as all other vocational education programs; and, (2) with instruments and/or procedures different than those used in the state's on-going system for evaluating all vocational education programs.

During telephone interviews, consultants in these states revealed they controlled the evaluation design by acting as the external evaluator. The consultant: a) made an on-site visit; b) determined whether the program was meetings its goals and objectives as stated in its funding proposal; and, c) wrote the final program evaluation report.

Consultants in this group expressed they knew their H/D programs well and, thus, did not need to conduct an evaluation using formally structured instruments and/or procedures. Some consultants referred to using H/D program standards "if necessary" to aid in the evaluation of a "marginal" program. Others indicated they evaluated programs through informal visits and observations of the program over an indefinite period of time. Three consultants expressed a personal desire to have a formally structured H/D program evaluation system, but each was doubtful whether federal and/or state funds would be made available to develop and implement such a system.

Telephone interviews identified three states in the process of developing their H/D program evaluation systems. The consultants of two states disclosed their SEA's were in the process of developing entirely new SEA evaluation systems based on results of Federal monitoring reviews by the U.S. Department of Education. The other state's consultant disclosed a new SEA evaluation system was being developed to meet evaluation guidelines recently mandated by the State Director of Vocational Education.

One state did not evaluate H/D vocational education programs. This state's consultant stated the SEA had never conducted evaluations of H/D programs in the past, nor was the consultant aware of plans to conduct such evaluations in the future.

V. CONCLUSIONS

The evaluation of handicapped and disadvantaged vocational education appeared to be an organized activity in most rural states. More than two-thirds of the sample states, 10 of 14 states, evaluated H/D programs.

Although all states evaluated H/D programs at the same time as all other vocational education programs were being evaluated, only one state evaluated H/D programs as part of its total SEA vocational education program evaluation system. In the other nine states, H/D programs were evaluated separately, apart from, other vocational education programs.

The predominate evaluation strategy used for assessing H/D programs was to have an external evaluator(s) visit each program to talk with the instructor(s), interview students, view program facilities and records, observe the program in operation, and report findings to the SEA. In the one state without an external evaluator component, the strategy was to include H/D program assessment questions within the SEA's opinion survey administered to individuals involved in and/or affected by all vocational education programs.

Based on the analysis of documents provided by states with formally structured evaluation instruments and procedures, the types of strategies used for assessing H/D program planning and operational processes were determined by each state's preference for either a SEA controlled (centralized) or a LEA controlled (decentralized) evaluation design. States with a centralized evaluation design utilized control strategies for conducting evaluations which overtly involved the H/D consultant in all phases of each program evaluation, limited the extent of LEA involvement in program evaluation activities, and placed responsibility for writing the final program evaluation report on the H/D consultant. In contrast, states with a decentralized evaluation design utilized control strategies for conducting evaluations which minimized involvement of the H/D consultant in program evaluation activities, encouraged LEA involvement during program evaluation activities, and excluded the H/D consultant from participation in preparation of the final program evaluation report.

However, regardless of whether the SEA preferred a centralized or a decentralized evaluation design, all SEA's with formally structured evaluation instruments and procedures used the same strategies for controlling the content of evaluative questions and the recording of evaluator's assessments. In each state, this control was effected through the joint strategies of requiring an evaluator(s) to use SEA prescribed: (1) questions for assessing the effectiveness of program planning and operational processes; and, (2) Likert-type scales for recording their opinions about the extent of H/D program planning and operational processes.

All states conducting H/D program evaluation but without formally structured instruments or procedures had centralized evaluation designs. Among these states, the sole evaluation strategy was to have the H/D consultant act as an external evaluator, but without formal SEA strategies for assessing the effectiveness of program planning and operational processes. In essence, the H/D consultant determined the conduct, content and recording of program evaluations on a program-by-program basis.

VI. DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The number of operational process indicators recorded by the researcher appeared to have little relationship with consultant ratings of how effectively their evaluation systems were able to assess H/D program operational processes. For Example: State # 3 had six indicators and state # 5 had one indicator of program operational processes (see Table 2 on page 33). But, on a scale of 1 to 5, 5 being the highest, each of these state's consultants rated their evaluation system's effectiveness as "5" (see Table 4 on page 43). Apparently, regardless of how many indicators were present in the SEA's evaluation documents, some other factor(s) must have influenced the ratings of consultants about the effectiveness of their systems for assessing program operational processes.

One influencing factor appeared to be the extent of SEA involvement in activities during assessment of LEA program operational processes. In states with an on-site, SEA appointed, evaluation team component (states #1, #3 and #5), consultants rated their evaluation system as very effective for assessing program operational processes. But, in states without an on-site, SEA appointed, evaluation team component (states #2 and #4), consultants rated their system as less than effective for assessing program operational processes.

This observation suggests the need for further research to determine whether the LEA's of sample states would agree with reported consultant ratings of their SEA evaluation system's effectiveness. If, for example, LEA's of states with centralized evaluation designs (states #1, #2 and #3) reported direct SEA involvement increased the effectiveness of program evaluations and the LEA's of states with decentralized evaluation designs (states #2 and #4) identified the lack of direct SEA involvement decreased the effectiveness of program evaluations, then the degree of SEA involvement may proportionately increase program evaluation effectiveness. Perhaps, if SEA involvement increases the effectiveness of program evaluations, then SEA participation in all evaluation activities should be part of each state's program evaluation design.

Another discrepancy in the study data became apparent when consultant opinions about the "purposes" for conducting evaluations were compared with their opinions about how they as consultants "used" program evaluation results. Of the 14 purposes for evaluating H/D programs reported by consultants (see Table 3 on page 41), only the purpose of program evaluation "to provide information for program improvement" was mentioned by all consultants. However, as can be seen in Table 5 on page 46, consultants used program evaluation results for making program improvement recommendations and for determining whether program improvement recommendations had been implemented by the LEA's. Evidently, although not mentioned by consultants, another purpose of program evaluation was to provide criteria for determining whether LEA's had implemented program improvement recommendations.

Based on this analysis of data, it was unclear to the researcher whether consultants were providing technical assistance when they visited programs (e.g. offering equipment modification suggestions and curriculum revisions to meet the learning needs of a handicapped student), and/or, whether consultants were making compliance checks when they visited programs (e.g. monitoring the extent of program improvement in order to determine if the program should be refunded). Perhaps, as reflected in the following comments of consultants about how they thought LEA's used program evaluation results, SEA's mostly "used" results to provide information for compliance checks:

> "LEA's implement them (recommendations for program improvement). If they don't, we don't refund the program again" (p. 44); and,

> "If the LEA likes the evaluation, they seem to keep the program. If not, they drop it and make a new

> application for another H/D program. They don't seem to like improving on what they had". (p.45)

However, if SEA's use program evaluation results for the predominate purpose of providing information to make program compliance checks, LEA's may simply be making program improvements in order to secure refunding or terminating programs to avoid SEA monitoring practices. A study focusing on LEA program implementation practices could be helpful in defining the state's role in working with LEA's about program improvement matters.

To developers of state systems for evaluating H/D programs and services, the following general recommendations are offered:

- Identify the SEA's specific purposes for evaluating H/D programs and services.

- Determine the extent to which the SEA will be directly involved in evaluation activities (e.g. during LEA orientation meetings, during the actual conduct of the evaluation, during preparation of the final program evaluation report).

- Establish with the SEA who will be responsible for the actual conduct of the program evaluations (e.g. the H/D consultant, a LEA or SEA appointed evaluation team, an independent third party evaluator).

- Have the SEA define and enumerate how program evaluation results will be used after programs have been evaluated.

- Build into the state's H/D program evaluation system a mechanism for assessing the impact of program evaluation on the SEA, LEA's, and programs and services for handicapped and disadvantaged vocational education students.

REFERENCE NOTES

1. Frasier, J. & Albright, L. Toward Building A Special Needs Evaluation Component Into The QAS. Burlington, Vt.: Department of Vocational Education and Technology, 1981.

2. Thomas, H.B. Personal Communication, April 19, 1982.

3. Wentling, T.L. Personal Communication, April 19, 1982.

REFERENCES

Barlow, M. 200 Years of Vocational Education: Special Bicentennial Issue. American Vocational Journal. 1976, Vol. 51, No. 5, pp. 81-82.

Berelson, B. Content Analysis in Communication Research. New York: Hafner Publishing Co. 1971.

Beuke, V.L.; Lukas, C.V.; Brigham, N.; Glick, G.S.; and Breen, J.P. Implementation of the Education Amendments of 1976: A Study of State and Social Compliance and Evaluation Practices. Prepared under NIE Contract No. 400-78-0041. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Abt Associates, Inc., December 1980.

Bryan, F.M. Politics in the Rural States: People, Parties, and Processes. Boulder: Westview Press, 1981.

Essex, M.W. Vocational Education: The Bridge Between Man and His Work. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1968. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 021-151)

Erdos, P.L. Professional Mail Surveys. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970.

Federal Rules and Regulations, October 3, 1977 (Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education). Washington, D.C.; U.S. Government Printing Office, 1974.

General Accounting Office. What is the Role of Federal Assistance for Vocational Education? (Report to Congress by the Comptroller General of the United States, December 31, 1974). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1974.

Lee, A.M. Project Baseline: Historical Foundations of Vocational Education Statistics. *Educational Researcher*, 1977, *67*, pp. 3-9.

Moser, C.A., & Kalton, G. *Survey Methods in Social Investigation*. New York: Basic Books, 1972.

Olympus Research Corporation. *An Assessment of Vocational Education Programs for the Handicapped Under Part B of the 1968 Amendments to the Vocational Education Act.* Salt Lake City: Olympus Research Corporation, 1974. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 101-501)

Olympus Research Corporation. *An Assessment of Vocational Education Programs for the Disadvantaged Under Part A and Section 102 (b) of the 1968 Amendments to the Vocational Education Act*. Salt Lake City: Olympus Research Corporation, 1976. (ERIC Document Reproduction No. ED 133-368)

Phelps, L.A. Research on Vocational Education Programs for Special Populations: Research Review. In T.L. Wentling (Ed.) *Arrive: Annual Review of Research in Vocational Education*, Vol. one. Urbana: University of Illinois and Illinois State Board of Education, 1980.

P.L. 88-210. Vocational Education Act of 1963. *United States Statutes at Large*. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1964, Vol. 77.

P.L. 90-576. 1968 Vocational Education Act Amendments. *United States Statutes at Large*. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1969, Vol. 82.

P.L. 94-482. 1976 Vocational Education Act Amendments. *United States Statutes at Large*. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1978, Vol. 90, Part 2.

Sanders, J.R., & Cunningham, D.J. A Structure for Formative Evaluation in Project Development. *Review of Educational Research*, 1973, Vol. 43, No. 2, pp. 217-236.

Smith, M.L. The Context of Evaluation Practice in State Departments of Education. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* Vol. 4, No. 3, 1982, pp.373-386.

Smith, E.G., & Holt, N.L. State Evaluation of Vocational Education Programs: A National Study of Evaluation Procedures and Practices. *The Journal of Vocational Education Research*, 1980, Vol. V., No. 1, pp. 17-39.

Smith, E.G., & Holt, N.L. *State of the Art of Vocational Education Evaluation: State Evaluation Procedures and Practices* Belmont, Massachusetts: CRC Education and Human Development, Inc., January 1979.

Stufflebeam, D.L. *Evaluating the Context, Input, Process and Product of Education*. Paper presented at the International Congress on the Evaluation of Physical Education, Jyvaskyla, Finland, 1976.

Stufflebeam, D.L., Foley, W.J., Gephart, W.J., Guba, E.G., Hammond, R.I., Merriman, H.O., & Provus, M.M. *Education Evaluation and Decision Making*. Ithica: F.E. Peacock Publishers, 1971.

Thomas, H.B., & Margos, M.A. *A Study to Identify the Unique Criteria and Standards Required for the Evaluation of Bilingual Vocational Education Programs*. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, March 1982.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. *City and County Data Book, 1977* (A Statistical Abstract Supplement). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1978.

Wentling, T.L. A Survey of State Evaluation Practices in Vocational Education. Prepared under NIE Contract No. P-81-0126. Champaign, Illinois: University of Illinois, July 1981.

Wentling, T.L. Evaluating Occupational Education and Training Programs. Second Edition. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1980.

Wentling, T.L., & Barnard, W.S. A Study of State Evaluation Practices in Vocational Education. The Journal of Vocational Education Research, 1982, Vol. VII, No. 3, pp. 23-31.

Wentling, T.L., & Russo, R.P. A Review of Bases and Systems for the Evaluation of Services Provided to Special Needs Learners. The Journal of Vocational Education Research, 1978, Vol. III, No. 4, pp. 31-44.

Williams, E.J. Research Implications of Vocational Education for the Disadvantaged. In G. Law (Ed.) Contemporary Concepts in Vocational Education. Washington, D.C.: American Vocational Association, 1971.

APPENDIX A

GEOGRAPHIC DIVISIONS OF THE UNITED STATES AND RURAL STATES WITHIN EACH DIVISION

FOUR GEOGRAPHIC DIVISIONS OF THE UNITED STATES AND RURAL STATES WITHIN EACH DIVISION*

Geographic Division	Percent of Population Outside Central Cities and Suburbs
Northeast	
Maine	79
New Hampshire	73
**Vermont	100
North Central	
Iowa	65
Kansas	58
Nebraska	57
North Dakota	88
South Dakota	86
South	
Arkansas	69
Mississippi	82
Kentucky	60
North Carolina	62
South Carolina	61
West Virginia	68
West	
Alaska	100
Idaho	84
Montana	75
New Mexico	69
Wyoming	100

*The four geographic divisions are taken from the U.S. Bureau of the Census, County and City Data Book, 1977 and the identification of rural states and their respective percent of populations outside of central cities and suburbs from Politics in the Rural States: People, Parties and Processes by F.M. Bryan.

**Vermont was omitted from the stratified random selection of states.

APPENDIX B

LETTER TO EACH STATE'S HANDICAPPED AND DISADVANTAGED CONSULTANT

The University of Vermont
DEPARTMENT OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION & TECHNOLOGY
COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE, AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING BUILDING
BURLINGTON, VERMONT 05405
(802) 656-2001

February 3, 1982

Special Programs Unit
Department of Public Instruction
Division of Vocational Education
Education Building,

Dear

Thank you for favorably receiving my phone inquiry yesterday about information concerning evaluation of secondary handicapped and disadvantaged vocational education programs.

As I indicated to you in our conversation, the University of Vermont is under contract with the Vermont Division of Vocational Education to develop an evaluation system for secondary handicapped and disadvantaged programs. Our effort is to develop a two level, SEA-administered, evaluation system that can be:

1) integrated into Vermont's regular 5 year cycle for evaluation of all programs as per the 1976 evaluation mandates; and,

2) used as an independent instrument in the evaluation of an individual handicapped or disadvantaged program at the discretion of the Vermont Special Needs Consultant.

When we have completed the evaluation system our project develops for the Vermont Division of Vocational Education, I will send you a copy of the document.

I look forward to receiving handicapped and disadvantaged evaluation materials. Thank you for you help and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Jim Frasier
Evaluation Project Coordinator

An Equal Opportunity Employer

APPENDIX C

FORMATING OF "IF YES-THEN" QUESTION VARIABLES

___YES ___NO

IF YES: What SEA evaluation strategy formats are used to determine whether

____LEA Self-evaluation

____External Evaluation Team

____External Evaluation by an "expert"

____Independent Third Party Evaluation

____Evaluation by State Consultant

____other____________________

____using LEA developed instruments

____using SEA developed instruments

____using neither SEA or LEA developed instruments

____other____________________

D =s used in evaluation of disadvantaged programs
H =s used in evaluation of handicapped programs
D/H =s used in evaluation of both programs

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify how

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	- students	____	____
	- parents	____	____
	-administrators	____	____
	-vocational faculty	____	____
	-pupil support personnel	____	____
	-program advisory committee	____	____
	-other____________	____	____
Personal Interviews with	-students	____	____
	-parents	____	____
	-administrators	____	____
	-vocational faculty	____	____
	-pupil support personnel	____	____
	-program advisory committee	____	____
	-other____________	____	____
Review of student	-records	____	____
	-test scores	____	____
	-drop-out ratios	____	____
	-other____________	____	____
Review of LEA	-1 and 5 year plans	____	____
	-Grant Application (RFP)	____	____
	-End of year program report	____	____
	-other____________	____	____
Review of SEA	-Consultant's visit reports	____	____
	-Compliance reports	____	____
	-Minimum program standards	____	____
	-other____________	____	____

X =s YES ? =s UNCLEAR No Response =s Not present in document

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify the effectiveness of

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	-students	____	____
	-parents	____	____
	-administrators	____	____
	-vocational faculty	____	____
	-pupil support personnel	____	____
	-program advisory committee	____	____
	-other____________	____	____
Personal interviews with	-students	____	____
	-parents	____	____
	-administrators	____	____
	-vocational faculty	____	____
	-pupil support personnel	____	____
	-program advisory committee	____	____
	-other____________	____	____
Review of student	-records	____	____
	-test scores	____	____
	-drop-out ratios	____	____
	-other____________	____	____
Review of LEA	-1 and 5 year plans	____	____
	-Grant Application (RFP)	____	____
	-End of year program report	____	____
	-other____________	____	____
Review of SEA	-Consultant's visit reports	____	____
	-Compliance reports	____	____
	-Minimum program standards	____	____
	-other____________	____	____

X =s YES ? =s UNCLEAR No Response =s Not present in Document

COMMENTS CONCERNING CONTENT ANALYSIS:

APPENDIX D

RECORD OF REVIEWER CRITIQUES
AND
ACTION TAKEN

Procedures

The following three criteria were established by the researcher for determining the utility of reviewer's comments:

1. Only those reviewer comments and/or suggestions which clearly expanded the focus of the study were not added to the instruments. These were recorded as "BSTS" (Beyond the Scope of the Study).

2. All additions and/or modifications suggested by each reviewer would be added to the content analysis instruments.

3. Only those deletions suggested by the External Review Panel would be excluded from the content analysis instruments.

This appendix has been divided into three sections: (a) First Internal Review; (b) Second Internal Review; and (c) External Review Panel. Each section has a summary of individual reviewer's comments and a statement of action taken by the researcher in response to the reviewer's comments. The content analysis instruments used by each grouping of reviewers are presented at the end of each section.

FIRST INTERNAL REVIEW

FIRST INTERNAL REVIEW

Comments of Reviewer #1	Action Taken
No Comments	N/A

Comments of Reviewer #2	Action Taken
Intent of questions was unclear and wording of questions seemed awkward	All questions were reworded

Comments of Reviewer #3	Action Taken
Uncertain about the intent of differences between second and third "If YES:" questions	Comment noted by researcher

State Code #_____

MAJOR QUESTION:

What types of evaluation strategies are being used by the SEA to evaluate the Planning Processes of programs and services designed by LEAs for the disadvantaged and handicapped students enrolled in vocational education programs?

QUESTIONS CONCERNING THE STRUCTURE OF A SEA's EVALUATION DESIGN

I. Are disadvantaged and handicapped programs and services evaluated as part of, or separate from, the state's ongoing system for evaluating all vocational education programs within the period of the five year state plan?

_____as part of

_____separate from

If separate from, how often are disadvantaged and/or handicapped programs and services evaluated by the SEA?

Every______________for handicapped programs & services

Every______________for disadvantaged programs & services

II. Are disadvantaged and handicapped programs and services evaluated with a common instrument, or with individually designed instruments?

_____with a common instrument

_____with individual, separate instruments

_____with an inter-agency evaluation instrument designed in cooperation with vocational & special education

III. What is the present "use" status of the SEA's evaluation documents utilized for evaluation of handicapped and/or disadvantaged programs and services?

____currently being used without revision

____currently being used but with revisions or modifications

____currently being used but under revision

____no evaluation document currently being used, but the SEA is developing one for use within one year

____no evaluation document currently being used, nor does the SEA have plans for developing one

____no evaluation document(s) were furnished by the SEA for use in this study

SEA EVALUATION DOCUMENT PROFILE

What are the major evaluation strategy formats used by the SEA to evaluation the Planning Processes of LEA Programs and Services for disadvantaged and handicapped vocational education students?

	Disadvantaged	Handicapped
LEA Self-evaluation using SEA developed instruments		
LEA Self-evaluation using LEA developed instruments		
External Evaluation Team using SEA developed instruments		
External Evaluation Team using LEA developed instruments		
External evaluation by an "expert" using SEA developed instruments		
External evaluation by an "expert" using LEA developed instruments		
Independent Third Party Evaluation using neither SEA or LEA instruments		
Evaluation by State Consultant using SEA developed instruments		
Evaluation by State Consultant using LEA developed instruments		
Informal Evaluation by State Consultant using neither SEA or LEA instruments		
Other______________________________		

What are the evaluation strategies used by the SEAs to verify planning processes and to determine the effectiveness of procedures used in planning processes?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	- students		
	- parents		
	- administrators		
	- vocational faculty		
	- pupil support personnel		
	- program advisory committee		
	- other ____________________		
Personal interviews with	- students		
	- parents		
	- administrators		
	- vocational faculty		
	- pupil support personnel		
	- program advisory committee		
	- other ____________________		
Review of student	- records		
	- test scores		
	- drop-out ratios		
	- other ____________________		
Review of LEA	- 1 and 5 year Plans		
	- Grant Application (RFP)		
	- End of year program report		
	- other ____________________		
Review of SEA	- Consultant's visit reports		
	- Compliance reports		
	- Minimum program standards		
	- other ____________________		

1. Does the SEA evaluate the need for the program or service by assessing the LEA's efforts to identify and utilize resources and services available in the school and community for handicapped & disadvantaged students?

___Yes ___No

IF YES: What evaluation strategy formats are used by the SEA to determine the LEA's efforts to identify and utilize such resources & services?

	Disadvantaged	Handicapped
LEA Self-evaluation using SEA developed instruments	___	___
LEA Self-evaluation using LEA developed instruments	___	___
External Evaluation Team using SEA developed instruments	___	___
External Evaluation Team using LEA developed instruments	___	___
External evaluation by an "expert" using SEA developed instruments	___	___
External evaluation by an "expert" using LEA developed instruments	___	___
Independent Third Party Evaluation using neither SEA or LEA instruments	___	___
Evaluation by State Consultant using SEA developed instruments	___	___
Evaluation by State Consultant using LEA developed instruments	___	___
Informal Evaluation by State Consultant using neither SEA or LEA instruments	___	___
Other___________________	___	___

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used by the SEA to verify LEA efforts to identify and utilize such resources and services?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	- students	___	___
	- parents	___	___
	- administrators	___	___
	- vocational faculty	___	___
	- pupil support personnel	___	___
	- program advisory committee	___	___
	- other___________	___	___
Personal interviews with	- students	___	___
	- parents	___	___
	- administrators	___	___
	- vocational faculty	___	___
	- pupil support personnel	___	___
	- program advisory committee	___	___
	- other___________	___	___
Review of student	- records	___	___
	- test scores	___	___
	- drop-out ratios	___	___
	- other___________	___	___
Review of LEA	- 1 and 5 year Plans	___	___
	- Grant Application (RFP)		
	- End of year program report		
	- other___________		
Review of SEA	- Consultant's visit reports	___	___
	- Compliance reports	___	___
	- Minimum program standards	___	___
	- other___________	___	___
The SEA does not seek to verify LEA efforts to identify & utilize such resources & services		___	___

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used by the SEA to verify the effectiveness of procedures used to identify such resources and sevices?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	- students	___	___
	- parents	___	___
	- administrators	___	___
	- vocational faculty	___	___
	- pupil support personnel	___	___
	- program advisory committee	___	___
	- other___________	___	___
Personal interviews with	- students	___	___
	- parents	___	___
	- administrators	___	___
	- vocational faculty	___	___
	- pupil support personnel	___	___
	- program advisory committee	___	___
	- other___________	___	___
Review of student	- records	___	___
	- test scores	___	___
	- drop-out rates	___	___
	- other___________	___	___
Review of LEA	- 1 and 5 year Plans	___	___
	- Grant Application (RFP)	___	___
	- End of year program report	___	___
	- other___________	___	___
Review of SEA	- Consultant's visit reports	___	___
	- Compliance reports	___	___
	- Minimum program standards	___	___
	- other___________	___	___
The SEA does not seek to verify the effectiveness of procedures used to identify & utilize such resources & services		___	___

COMMENTS CONCERNING CONTENT ANALYSIS:

2. Does the SEA evaluate how the handicapped or disadvantaged student is identified as needing services in order to succeed in a vocational education program?

___Yes ___No

IF YES: What evaluation strategy formats are used by the SEA to determine how students in need of services are identified?

	Disadvantaged	Handicapped
LEA Self-evaluation using SEA developed instruments	___	___
LEA Self-evaluation using LEA developed instruments	___	___
External Evaluation Team using SEA developed instruments	___	___
External Evaluation Team using LEA developed instruments	___	___
External evaluation by an "expert" using SEA developed instruments	___	___
External evaluation by an "expert" using LEA developed instruments	___	___
Independent Third Party Evaluation using neither SEA or LEA instruments	___	___
Evaluation by State Consultant using SEA developed instruments	___	___
Evaluation by State Consultant using LEA developed instruments	___	___
Informal Evaluation by State Consultant using neither SEA or LEA instruments	___	___
Other______________________	___	___

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used by the SEA to verify that students are correctly identified as needing services?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	- students	___	___
	- parents	___	___
	- administrators	___	___
	- vocational faculty	___	___
	- pupil support personnel	___	___
	- program advisory committee	___	___
	- other______________	___	___
Personal interviews with	- students	___	___
	- parents	___	___
	- administrators	___	___
	- vocational faculty	___	___
	- pupil support personnel	___	___
	- program advisory committee	___	___
	- other______________	___	___
Review of student	- records	___	___
	- test scores	___	___
	- drop-out ratios	___	___
	- other______________	___	___
Review of LEA	- 1 and 5 year Plans	___	___
	- Grant Application (RFP)		
	- End of year program report		
	- other______________		
Review of SEA	- Consultant's visit reports	___	___
	- Compliance reports	___	___
	- Minimum program standards	___	___
	- other______________	___	___
The SEA does not seek to verify that students are correctly identified as needing services		___	___

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used by the SEA to verify the effectiveness of procedures used to identify students in need of special services?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	- students	___	___
	- parents	___	___
	- administrators	___	___
	- vocational faculty	___	___
	- pupil support personnel	___	___
	- program advisory committee	___	___
	- other______________	___	___
Personal interviews with	- students	___	___
	- parents	___	___
	- administrators	___	___
	- vocational faculty	___	___
	- pupil support personnel	___	___
	- program advisory committee	___	___
	- other______________	___	___
Review of student	- records	___	___
	- test scores	___	___
	- drop-out rates	___	___
	- other______________	___	___
Review of LEA	- 1 and 5 year Plans	___	___
	- Grant Application (RFP)	___	___
	- End of year program report	___	___
	- other______________	___	___
Review of SEA	- Consultant's visit reports	___	___
	- Compliance reports	___	___
	- Minimum program standards	___	___
	- other______________	___	___
The SEA does not seek to verify the effectiveness of procedures used to identify students in need of special services		___	___

COMMENTS CONCERNING CONTENT ANALYSIS:

3. Does the SEA evaluate if only those handicapped & disadvantaged students unable to succeed in a vocational education program are served by the program or service?

___Yes ___No

IF YES: What evaluation strategy formats are used by the SEA to determine that only such students are served?

	Disadvantaged	Handicapped
LEA Self-evaluation using SEA developed instruments	___	___
LEA Self-evaluation using LEA developed instruments	___	___
External Evaluation Team using SEA developed instruments	___	___
External Evaluation Team using LEA developed instruments	___	___
External evaluation by an "expert" using SEA developed instruments	___	___
External evaluation by an "expert" using LEA developed instruments	___	___
Independent Third Party Evaluation using neither SEA or LEA instruments	___	___
Evaluation by State Consultant using SEA developed instruments	___	___
Evaluation by State Consultant using LEA developed instruments	___	___
Informal Evaluation by State Consultant using neither SEA or LEA instruments	___	___
Other ______________________	___	___

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used by the SEA to verify that only students needing services are served?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	- students	___	___
	- parents	___	___
	- administrators	___	___
	- vocational faculty	___	___
	- pupil support personnel	___	___
	- program advisory committee	___	___
	- other ______________	___	___
Personal interviews with	- students	___	___
	- parents	___	___
	- administrators	___	___
	- vocational faculty	___	___
	- pupil support personnel	___	___
	- program advisory committee	___	___
	- other ______________	___	___
Review of student	- records	___	___
	- test scores	___	___
	- drop-out ratios	___	___
	- other ______________	___	___
Review of LEA	- 1 and 5 year Plans	___	___
	- Grant Application (RFP)		
	- End of year program report		
	- other ______________		
Review of SEA	- Consultant's visit reports	___	___
	- Compliance reports	___	___
	- Minimum program standards	___	___
	- other ______________	___	___
The SEA does not seek to verify that only students needing services are served		___	___

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used by the SEA to verify the effectiveness of procedures used to ensure that only such students are served?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	- students	___	___
	- parents	___	___
	- administrators	___	___
	- vocational faculty	___	___
	- pupil support personnel	___	___
	- program advisory committee	___	___
	- other ______________	___	___
Personal interviews with	- students	___	___
	- parents	___	___
	- administrators	___	___
	- vocational faculty	___	___
	- pupil support personnel	___	___
	- program advisory committee	___	___
	- other ______________	___	___
Review of student	- records	___	___
	- test scores	___	___
	- drop-out rates	___	___
	- other ______________	___	___
Review of LEA	- 1 and 5 year Plans	___	___
	- Grant Application (RFP)	___	___
	- End of year program report	___	___
	- other ______________	___	___
Review of SEA	- Consultant's visit reports	___	___
	- Compliance reports	___	___
	- Minimum program standards	___	___
	- other ______________	___	___
The SEA does not seek to verify the effectiveness of procedures used to ensure that only handicapped & Disadvantaged students are served		___	___

COMMENTS CONCERNING CONTENT ANALYSIS:

4. Does the SEA evaluate how the program or service assesses the unmet needs of individual program or service participants?

___Yes ___No

IF YES: What evaluation strategy formats are used by the SEA to determine how a student's unmet needs are identified?

	Disadvantaged	Handicapped
LEA Self-evaluation using SEA developed instruments		
LEA Self-evaluation using LEA developed instruments		
External Evaluation Team using SEA developed instruments		
External Evaluation Team using LEA developed instruments		
External evaluation by an "expert" using SEA developed instruments		
External evaluation by an "expert" using LEA developed instruments		
Independent Third Party Evaluation using neither SEA or LEA instruments		
Evaluation by State Consultant using SEA developed instruments		
Evaluation by State Consultant using LEA developed instruments		
Informal Evaluation by State Consultant using neither SEA or LEA instruments		
Other ____________________		

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used by the SEA to verify that a student's unmet needs are correctly identified?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	- students		
	- parents		
	- administrators		
	- vocational faculty		
	- pupil support personnel		
	- program advisory committee		
	- other ____________		
Personal interviews with	- students		
	- parents		
	- administrators		
	- vocational faculty		
	- pupil support personnel		
	- program advisory committee		
	- other ____________		
Review of student	- records		
	- test scores		
	- drop-out ratios		
	- other ____________		
Review of LEA	- 1 and 5 year Plans		
	- Grant Application (RFP)		
	- End of year program report		
	- other ____________		
Review of SEA	- Consultant's visit reports		
	- Compliance reports		
	- Minimum program standards		
	- other ____________		
The SEA does not seek to verify how the unmet needs of a student are identified			

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used by the SEA to verify the effectiveness of procedures used to identify the unmet needs of a student?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	- students		
	- parents		
	- administrators		
	- vocational faculty		
	- pupil support personnel		
	- program advisory committee		
	- other ____________		
Personal interviews with	- students		
	- parents		
	- administrators		
	- vocational faculty		
	- pupil support personnel		
	- program advisory committee		
	- other ____________		
Review of student	- records		
	- test scores		
	- drop-out rates		
	- other ____________		
Review of LEA	- 1 and 5 year Plans		
	- Grant Application (RFP)		
	- End of year program report		
	- other ____________		
Review of SEA	- Consultant's visit reports		
	- Compliance reports		
	- Minimum program standards		
	- other ____________		
The SEA does not seek to verify the effectiveness of procedures used to identify the unmet needs of students			

COMMENTS CONCERNING CONTENT ANALYSIS:

5. Does the SEA evaluate how people knowledgeable about the student are involved in the assessment which identifies the student's unmet needs?

__Yes ___No

IF YES: What evaluation strategy formats are used by the SEA to determine the involvement of people knowledgeable about the student in the assessment which identifies the student's unmet needs?

	Disadvantaged	Handicapped
LEA Self-evaluation using SEA developed instruments	___	___
LEA Self-evaluation using LEA developed instruments	___	___
External Evaluation Team using SEA developed instruments	___	___
External Evaluation Team using LEA developed instruments	___	___
External evaluation by an "expert" using SEA developed instruments	___	___
External evaluation by an "expert" using LEA developed instruments	___	___
Independent Third Party Evaluation using neither SEA or LEA instruments	___	___
Evaluation by State Consultant using SEA developed instruments	___	___
Evaluation by State Consultant using LEA developed instruments	___	___
Informal Evaluation by State Consultant using neither SEA or LEA instruments	___	___
Other ______________________	___	___

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used by the SEA to verify LEA efforts to involve such people in the assessment?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	- students	___	___
	- parents	___	___
	- administrators	___	___
	- vocational faculty	___	___
	- pupil support personnel	___	___
	- program advisory committee	___	___
	- other ______________	___	___
Personal interviews with	- students	___	___
	- parents	___	___
	- administrators	___	___
	- vocational faculty	___	___
	- pupil support personnel	___	___
	- program advisory committee	___	___
	- other ______________	___	___
Review of student	- records	___	___
	- test scores	___	___
	- drop-out ratios	___	___
	- other ______________	___	___
Review of LEA	- 1 and 5 year Plans	___	___
	Grant Application (RFP)		
	- End of year program report		
	- other ______________		
Review of SEA	- Consultant's visit reports	___	___
	- Compliance reports	___	___
	- Minimum program standards	___	___
	- other ______________	___	___
The SEA does not seek to verify the involvement of such people in the assessment		___	___

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used by the SEA to verify the effectiveness of procedures used to involve people in the assessment which identifies the student's unmet needs?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	- students	___	___
	- parents	___	___
	- administrators	___	___
	- vocational faculty	___	___
	- pupil support personnel	___	___
	- program advisory committee	___	___
	- other ______________	___	___
Personal interviews with	- students	___	___
	- parents	___	___
	- administrators	___	___
	- vocational faculty	___	___
	- pupil support personnel	___	___
	- program advisory committee	___	___
	- other ______________	___	___
Review of student	- records	___	___
	- test scores	___	___
	- drop-out rates	___	___
	- other ______________	___	___
Review of LEA	- 1 and 5 year Plans	___	___
	- Grant Application (RFP)	___	___
	- End of year program report	___	___
	- other ______________	___	___
Review of SEA	- Consultant's visit reports	___	___
	- Compliance reports	___	___
	- Minimum program standards	___	___
	- other ______________	___	___
The SEA does not seek to verify the effectiveness of procedures used to involve people in the assessment which identifies the student's unmet needs		___	___

COMMENTS CONCERNING CONTENT ANALYSIS:

Does the SEA evaluate how the unmet needs of individual program or service participants influence the formation of goals and objectives for an individual participant?

___Yes ___No

IF YES: What evaluation strategy formats are used by the SEA to determine how individual participants influence the formation of their respective goals and objectives?

	Disadvantaged	Handicapped
LEA Self-evaluation using SEA developed instruments	___	___
LEA Self-evaluation using LEA developed instruments	___	___
External Evaluation Team using SEA developed instruments	___	___
External Evaluation Team using LEA developed instruments	___	___
External evaluation by an "expert" using SEA developed instruments	___	___
External evaluation by an "expert" using LEA developed instruments	___	___
Independent Third Party Evaluation using neither SEA or LEA instruments	___	___
Evaluation by State Consultant using SEA developed instruments	___	___
Evaluation by State Consultant using LEA developed instruments	___	___
Informal Evaluation by State Consultant using neither SEA or LEA instruments	___	___
Other ______________	___	___

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used by the SEA to verify that individual participants influence the formation of their respective goals and objectives?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	- students	___	___
	- parents	___	___
	- administrators	___	___
	- vocational faculty	___	___
	- pupil support personnel	___	___
	- program advisory committee	___	___
	- other ______________	___	___
Personal interviews with	- students	___	___
	- parents	___	___
	- administrators	___	___
	- vocational faculty	___	___
	- pupil support personnel	___	___
	- program advisory committee	___	___
	- other ______________	___	___
Review of student	- records	___	___
	- test scores	___	___
	- drop-out ratios	___	___
	- other ______________	___	___
Review of LEA	- 1 and 5 year Plans	___	___
	- Grant Application (RFP)		
	- End of year program report		
	- other ______________		
Review of SEA	- Consultant's visit reports	___	___
	- Compliance reports	___	___
	- Minimum program standards	___	___
	- other ______________	___	___
The SEA does not seek to verify that individual participants influence formation of goals & objectives		___	___

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used by the SEA to verify the effectiveness of procedures used by the LEA with individual participants to provide for influencing the formation of their respective goals and objectives?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	- students	___	___
	- parents	___	___
	- administrators	___	___
	- vocational faculty	___	___
	- pupil support personnel	___	___
	- program advisory committee	___	___
	- other ______________	___	___
Personal interviews with	- students	___	___
	- parents	___	___
	- administrators	___	___
	- vocational faculty	___	___
	- pupil support personnel	___	___
	- program advisory committee	___	___
	- other ______________	___	___
Review of student	- records	___	___
	- test scores	___	___
	- drop-out ratios	___	___
	- other ______________	___	___
Review of LEA	- 1 and 5 year Plans	___	___
	- Grant Application (RFP)	___	___
	- End of year program report	___	___
	- other ______________	___	___
Review of SEA	- Consultant's visit reports	___	___
	- Compliance reports	___	___
	- Minimum program standards	___	___
	- other ______________	___	___
The SEA does not seek to verify the effectiveness of procedures used to provide for participant's influencing of their respective goals & objectives		___	___

COMMENTS CONCERNING CONTENT ANALYSIS:

MICROFILMED FROM
BEST AVAILABLE COPY

7. Does the SEA evaluate how the unmet needs of program or service participants influence formation of the LEA's program or service goals and objectives?

___Yes ___No

IF YES: What evaluation strategy formats are used by the SEA to determine how individual participant's unmet needs influence the formation of the LEA's program or service goals & objectives?

	Disadvantaged	Handicapped
LEA Self-evaluation using SEA developed instruments	___	___
LEA Self-evaluation using LEA developed instruments	___	___
External Evaluation Team using SEA developed instruments	___	___
External Evaluation Team using LEA developed instruments	___	___
External evaluation by an "expert" using SEA developed instruments	___	___
External evaluation by an "expert" using LEA developed instruments	___	___
Independent Third Party Evaluation using neither SEA or LEA instruments	___	___
Evaluation by State Consultant using SEA developed instruments	___	___
Evaluation by State Consultant using LEA developed instruments	___	___
Informal Evaluation by State Consultant using neither SEA or LEA instruments	___	___
Other ______________	___	___

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used by the SEA to verify that individual participant's unment needs influence the formation of the LEA's program or service goals and objectives?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	- students	___	___
	- parents	___	___
	- administrators	___	___
	- vocational faculty	___	___
	- pupil support personnel	___	___
	- program advisory committee	___	___
	- other ______________	___	___
Personal interviews with	- students	___	___
	- parents	___	___
	- administrators	___	___
	- vocational faculty	___	___
	- pupil support personnel	___	___
	- program advisory committee	___	___
	- other ______________	___	___
Review of student	- records	___	___
	- test scores	___	___
	- drop-out ratios	___	___
	- other ______________	___	___
Review of LEA	- 1 and 5 year Plans	___	___
	- Grant Application (RFP)		
	- End of year program report		
	- other ______________		
Review of SEA	- Consultant's visit reports	___	___
	- Compliance reports	___	___
	- Minimum program standards	___	___
	- other ______________	___	___
The SEA does not seek to verify how participant's unmet needs influence program goals & objectives		___	___

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used by the SEA to verify the effectiveness of procedures used by the LEA with participants to provide for their influencing the formation of the LEA's program or service goals and objectives?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	- students	___	___
	- parents	___	___
	- administrators	___	___
	- vocational faculty	___	___
	- pupil support personnel	___	___
	- program advisory committee	___	___
	- other ______________	___	___
Personal interviews with	- students	___	___
	- parents	___	___
	- administrators	___	___
	- vocational faculty	___	___
	- pupil support personnel	___	___
	- program advisory committee	___	___
	- other ______________	___	___
Review of student	- records	___	___
	- test scores	___	___
	- drop-out rates	___	___
	- other ______________	___	___
Review of LEA	- 1 and 5 year Plans	___	___
	- Grant Application (RFP)	___	___
	- End of year program report	___	___
	- other ______________	___	___
Review of SEA	- Consultant's visit reports	___	___
	- Compliance reports	___	___
	- Minimum program standards	___	___
	- other ______________	___	___
The SEA does not seek to verify the effectiveness of procedures used to provide for the participation of program participants in the formation of LEA program goals and objectives		___	___

COMMENTS CONCERNING CONTENT ANALYSIS:

8. Does the SEA evaluate how the student's vocational instructor is involved in the planning process which develops goals and objectives for meeting the student's unmet needs?

___Yes ___No

IF YES: What evaluation strategy formats are used by the SEA to determine how the vocational instructor is involved in such planning?

	Disadvantaged	Handicapped
LEA Self-evaluation using SEA developed instruments	___	___
LEA Self-evaluation using LEA developed instruments	___	___
External Evaluation Team using SEA developed instruments	___	___
External Evaluation Team using LEA developed instruments	___	___
External evaluation by an "expert" using SEA developed instruments	___	___
External evaluation by an "expert" using LEA developed instruments	___	___
Independent Third Party Evaluation using neither SEA or LEA instruments	___	___
Evaluation by State Consultant using SEA developed instruments	___	___
Evaluation by State Consultant using LEA developed instruments	___	___
Informal Evaluation by State Consultant using neither SEA or LEA instruments	___	___
Other______________________	___	___

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used by the SEA to verify that the vocational instructor is involved in the planning process?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	- students	___	___
	- parents	___	___
	- administrators	___	___
	- vocational faculty	___	___
	- pupil support personnel	___	___
	- program advisory committee	___	___
	- other ______________	___	___
Personal interviews with	- students	___	___
	- parents	___	___
	- administrators	___	___
	- vocational faculty	___	___
	- pupil support personnel	___	___
	- program advisory committee	___	___
	- other ______________	___	___
Review of student	- records	___	___
	- test scores	___	___
	- drop-out ratios	___	___
	- other ______________	___	___
Review of LEA	- 1 and 5 year Plans	___	___
	- Grant Application (RFP)		
	- End of year program report		
	other ______________		
Review of SEA	- Consultant's visit reports	___	___
	- Compliance reports	___	___
	- Minimum program standards	___	___
	- other ______________	___	___
The SEA does not seek to verify the vocational instructor's involvement in such planning		___	___

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used by the SEA to verify the effectiveness of procedures used by the LEA to involve the vocational instructor in planning which develops the goals and objectives for meeting the student's unmet needs?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	- students	___	___
	- parents	___	___
	- administrators	___	___
	- vocational faculty	___	___
	- pupil support personnel	___	___
	- program advisory committee	___	___
	- other ______________	___	___
Personal interviews with	- students	___	___
	- parents	___	___
	- administrators	___	___
	- vocational faculty	___	___
	- pupil support personnel	___	___
	- program advisory committee	___	___
	- other ______________	___	___
Review of student	- records	___	___
	- test scores	___	___
	- drop-out rates	___	___
	- other ______________	___	___
Review of LEA	- 1 and 5 year Plans	___	___
	- Grant Application (RFP)	___	___
	- End of year program report	___	___
	- other ______________	___	___
Review of SEA	- Consultant's visit reports	___	___
	- Compliance reports	___	___
	- Minimum program standards	___	___
	- other ______________	___	___
The SEA does not seek to verify the effectiveness of procedures used to involve the vocational instructor in planning which develops the goals and objectives for meeting the student's unmet needs		___	___

COMMENTS CONCERNING CONTENT ANALYSIS:

9. Does the SEA evaluate how people knowledgeable about the needs of disadvantaged and handicapped persons are involved in the planning which influences the formation of the program or service's goals and objectives?

___Yes ___No

IF YES: What evaluation strategy formats are used by the SEA to determine how such knowledgeable persons are involved in planning?

	Disadvantaged	Handicapped
LEA Self-evaluation using SEA developed instruments	___	___
LEA Self-evaluation using LEA developed instruments	___	___
External Evaluation Team using SEA developed instruments	___	___
External Evaluation Team using LEA developed instruments	___	___
External evaluation by an "expert" using SEA developed instruments	___	___
External evaluation by an "expert" using LEA developed instruments	___	___
Independent Third Party Evaluation using neither SEA or LEA instruments	___	___
Evaluation by State Consultant using SEA developed instruments	___	___
Evaluation by State Consultant using LEA developed instruments	___	___
Informal Evaluation by State Consultant using neither SEA or LEA instruments	___	___
Other________________	___	___

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used by the SEA to verify the involvement of such persons in the planning which influences program goals & objectives?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	- students	___	___
	- parents	___	___
	- administrators	___	___
	- vocational faculty	___	___
	- pupil support personnel	___	___
	- program advisory committee	___	___
	- other____________	___	___
Personal interviews with	- students	___	___
	- parents	___	___
	- administrators	___	___
	- vocational faculty	___	___
	- pupil support personnel	___	___
	- program advisory committee	___	___
	- other____________	___	___
Review of student	- records	___	___
	- test scores	___	___
	- drop-out ratios	___	___
	- other____________	___	___
Review of LEA	- 1 and 5 year Plans	___	___
	- Grant Application (RFP)		
	- End of year program report		
	- other____________		
Review of SEA	- Consultant's visit reports	___	___
	- Compliance reports	___	___
	- Minimum program standards	___	___
	- other____________	___	___
The SEA does not seek to verify how such persons are involved in planning		___	___

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used by the SEA to verify the effectiveness of procedures used to involve knowledgeable persons in the planning which influences the formation of program or service's goals and objectives?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	- students	___	___
	- parents	___	___
	- administrators	___	___
	- vocational faculty	___	___
	- pupil support personnel	___	___
	- program advisory committee	___	___
	- other____________	___	___
Personal interviews with	- students	___	___
	- parents	___	___
	- administrators	___	___
	- vocational faculty	___	___
	- pupil support personnel	___	___
	- program advisory committee	___	___
	- other____________	___	___
Review of student	- records	___	___
	- test scores	___	___
	- drop-out rates	___	___
	- other____________	___	___
Review of LEA	- 1 and 5 year Plans	___	___
	- Grant Application (RFP)	___	___
	- End of year program report	___	___
	- other____________	___	___
Review of SEA	- Consultant's visit reports	___	___
	- Compliance reports	___	___
	- Minimum program standards	___	___
	- other____________	___	___
The SEA does not seek to verify the effectiveness of procedures used to involve such persons in this type of planning		___	___

COMMENTS CONCERNING CONTENT ANALYSIS:

State Code=___

MAJOR QUESTION:

What types of evaluation strategies are being used by the SEA to evaluate the Operational Processes of programs and services designed by LEAs for the disadvantaged and handicapped students enrolled in vocational education programs?

1. Does the SEA evaluate if the program or service is being implemented as originally planned?

___Yes ___No

IF YES: What evaluation strategy formats are used by the SEA to determine if the program or service is being implemented as originally planned?

	Disadvantaged	Handicapped
LEA Self-evaluation using SEA developed instruments	___	___
LEA Self-evaluation using LEA developed instruments	___	___
External Evaluation Team using SEA developed instruments	___	___
External Evaluation Team using LEA developed instruments	___	___
External evaluation by an "expert" using SEA developed instruments	___	___
External evaluation by an "expert" using LEA developed instruments	___	___
Independent Third Party Evaluation using neither SEA or LEA instruments	___	___
Evaluation by State Consultant using SEA developed instruments	___	___
Evaluation by State Consultant using LEA developed instruments	___	___
Informal Evaluation by State Consultant using neither SEA or LEA instruments	___	___
Other ______________________	___	___

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used by the SEA to verify that the program or service is being implemented as planned?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	- students	___	___
	- parents	___	___
	- administrators	___	___
	- vocational faculty	___	___
	- pupil support personnel	___	___
	- program advisory committee	___	___
	- other ______________	___	___
Personal interviews with	- students	___	___
	- parents	___	___
	- administrators	___	___
	- vocational faculty	___	___
	- pupil support personnel	___	___
	- program advisory committee	___	___
	- other ______________	___	___
Review of student	- records	___	___
	- test scores	___	___
	- drop-out ratios	___	___
	- other ______________	___	___
Review of LEA	- 1 and 5 year Plans	___	___
	- Grant Application (RFP)		
	- End of year program report		
	- other ______________		
Review of SEA	- Consultant's visit reports	___	___
	- Compliance reports	___	___
	- Minimum program standards	___	___
	- other ______________	___	___
The SEA does not seek to verify if the program or service is being implemented as planned		___	___

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used by the SEA to verify the effe[illegible]ess of procedures used to implement the program or service?

		Disadvantaged	[illegible]apped
Written survey of	- students	___	___
	- parents	___	___
	- administrators	___	___
	- vocational faculty	___	___
	- pupil support personnel	___	___
	- program advisory committee	___	___
	- other ______________	___	___
Personal interviews with	- students	___	___
	- parents	___	___
	- administrators	___	___
	- vocational faculty	___	___
	- pupil support personnel	___	___
	- program advisory committee	___	___
	- other ______________	___	___
Review of student	- records	___	___
	- test scores	___	___
	- drop-out rates	___	___
	- other ______________	___	___
Review of LEA	- 1 and 5 year Plans	___	___
	- Grant Application (RFP)	___	___
	- End of year program report	___	___
	- other ______________	___	___
Review of SEA	- Consultant's visit reports	___	___
	- Compliance reports	___	___
	- Minimum program standards	___	___
	- other ______________	___	___
The SEA does not seek to verify the effectiveness of procedures used to implement the program or service		___	___

COMMENTS CONCERNING CONTENT ANALYSIS:

2. Does the SEA evaluate the extent to which people involved in and affected by the program or service are in agreement with the purpose(s) of the program or service?

___Yes ___No

IF YES: What evaluation strategy formats are used by the SEA to determine if the individuals affected or involved in the program are in agreement?

	Disadvantaged	Handicapped
LEA Self-evaluation using SEA developed instruments	____	____
LEA Self-evaluation using LEA developed instruments	____	____
External Evaluation Team using SEA developed instruments	____	____
External Evaluation Team using LEA developed instruments	____	____
External evaluation by an "expert" using SEA developed instruments	____	____
External evaluation by an "expert" using LEA developed instruments	____	____
Independent Third Party Evaluation using neither SEA or LEA instruments	____	____
Evaluation by State Consultant using SEA developed instruments	____	____
Evaluation by State Consultant using LEA developed instruments	____	____
Informal Evaluation by State Consultant using neither SEA or LEA instruments	____	____
Other________________	____	____

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used by the SEA to verify that the persons involved or affected by the program are in agreement with the purpose(s)?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	- students	____	____
	- parents	____	____
	- administrators	____	____
	- vocational faculty	____	____
	- pupil support personnel	____	____
	- program advisory committee	____	____
	- other__________	____	____
Personal interviews with	- students	____	____
	- parents	____	____
	- administrators	____	____
	- vocational faculty	____	____
	- pupil support personnel	____	____
	- program advisory committee	____	____
	- other__________	____	____
Review of student	- records	____	____
	- test scores	____	____
	- drop-out ratios	____	____
	- other__________	____	____
Review of LEA	- 1 and 5 year Plans	____	____
	- Grant Application (RFP)		
	- End of year program report		
	- other__________		
Review of SEA	- Consultant's visit reports	____	____
	- Compliance reports	____	____
	- Minimum program standards	____	____
	- other__________	____	____
The SEA does not seek to verify if the individuals are in agreement with the purpose(s)		____	____

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used by the SEA to verify the effectiveness of procedures used to assess the agreement of individuals with the purpose(s)?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	- students	____	____
	- parents	____	____
	- administrators	____	____
	- vocational faculty	____	____
	- pupil support personnel	____	____
	- program advisory committee	____	____
	- other__________	____	____
Personal interviews with	- students	____	____
	- parents	____	____
	- administrators	____	____
	- vocational faculty	____	____
	- pupil support personnel	____	____
	- program advisory committee	____	____
	- other__________	____	____
Review of student	- records	____	____
	- test scores	____	____
	- drop-out rates	____	____
	- other__________	____	____
Review of LEA	- 1 and 5 year Plans	____	____
	- Grant Application (RFP)	____	____
	- End of year program report	____	____
	- other__________	____	____
Review of SEA	- Consultant's visit reports	____	____
	- Compliance reports	____	____
	- Minimum program standards	____	____
	- other__________	____	____
The SEA does not seek to verify the effectiveness of procedures used to assess agreement of individuals		____	____

COMMENTS CONCERNING CONTENT ANALYSIS:

5. Does the SEA evaluate the extent to which people involved in and affected by the program or service are aware of the services provided by the program or service?

___Yes ___No

IF YES: What evaluation strategy formats are used by the SEA to determine the extent of individual's awareness?

	Disadvantaged	Handicapped
LEA Self-evaluation using SEA developed instruments	___	___
LEA Self-evaluation using LEA developed instruments	___	___
External Evaluation Team using SEA developed instruments	___	___
External Evaluation Team using LEA developed instruments	___	___
External evaluation by an "expert" using SEA developed instruments	___	___
External evaluation by an "expert" using LEA developed instruments	___	___
Independent Third Party Evaluation using neither SEA or LEA instruments	___	___
Evaluation by State Consultant using SEA developed instruments	___	___
Evaluation by State Consultant using LEA developed instruments	___	___
Informal Evaluation by State Consultant using neither SEA or LEA instruments	___	___
Other______________________________	___	___

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used by the SEA to verify the extent of individual's awareness of the services provided by the program or service?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	- students	___	___
	- parents	___	___
	- administrators	___	___
	- vocational faculty	___	___
	- pupil support personnel	___	___
	- program advisory committee	___	___
	- other____________________	___	___
Personal interviews with	- students	___	___
	- parents	___	___
	- administrators	___	___
	- vocational faculty	___	___
	- pupil support personnel	___	___
	- program advisory committee	___	___
	- other____________________	___	___
Review of student	- records	___	___
	- test scores	___	___
	- drop-out ratios	___	___
	- other____________________	___	___
Review of LEA	- 1 and 5 year Plans	___	___
	- Grant Application (RFP)		
	- End of year program report		
	- other____________________		
Review of SEA	- Consultant's visit reports	___	___
	- Compliance reports	___	___
	- Minimum program standards	___	___
	- other____________________	___	___
The SEA does not seek to verify the extent of individual's awareness		___	___

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used by the SEA to verify the effectiveness of procedures used to assess the extent of individual awareness?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	- students	___	___
	- parents	___	___
	- administrators	___	___
	- vocational faculty	___	___
	- pupil support personnel	___	___
	- program advisory committee	___	___
	- other____________________	___	___
Personal interviews with	- students	___	___
	- parents	___	___
	- administrators	___	___
	- vocational faculty	___	___
	- pupil support personnel	___	___
	- program advisory committee	___	___
	- other____________________	___	___
Review of student	- records	___	___
	- test scores	___	___
	- drop-out rates	___	___
	- other____________________	___	___
Review of LEA	- 1 and 5 year Plans	___	___
	- Grant Application (RFP)	___	___
	- End of year program report	___	___
	- other____________________	___	___
Review of SEA	- Consultant's visit reports	___	___
	- Compliance reports	___	___
	- Minimum program standards	___	___
	- other____________________	___	___
The SEA does not seek to verify the effectiveness of procedures used to assess the extent of individual's awareness		___	___

COMMENTS CONCERNING CONTENT ANALYSIS:

4. Does the SEA evaluate what effect the program or service is having on a participant's performance in his/her vocational education program?

___Yes ___No

IF YES: What evaluation strategy formats are used by the SEA to determine the effect of the program or service upon the participant's performance?

	Disadvantaged	Handicapped
LEA Self-evaluation using SEA developed instruments	___	___
LEA Self-evaluation using LEA developed instruments	___	___
External Evaluation Team using SEA developed instruments	___	___
External Evaluation Team using LEA developed instruments	___	___
External evaluation by an "expert" using SEA developed instruments	___	___
External evaluation by an "expert" using LEA developed instruments	___	___
Independent Third Party Evaluation using neither SEA or LEA instruments	___	___
Evaluation by State Consultant using SEA developed instruments	___	___
Evaluation by State Consultant using LEA developed instruments	___	___
Informal Evaluation by State Consultant using neither SEA or LEA instruments	___	___
Other________________________________	___	___

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used by the SEA to verify the effect of the program or service upon the participant's performance?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	- students	___	___
	- parents	___	___
	- administrators	___	___
	- vocational faculty	___	___
	- pupil support personnel	___	___
	- program advisory committee	___	___
	- other___________________	___	___
Personal interviews with	- students	___	___
	- parents	___	___
	- administrators	___	___
	- vocational faculty	___	___
	- pupil support personnel	___	___
	- program advisory committee	___	___
	- other___________________	___	___
Review of student	- records	___	___
	- test scores	___	___
	- drop-out ratios	___	___
	- other___________________	___	___
Review of LEA	- 1 and 5 year Plans	___	___
	- Grant Application (RFP)		
	- End of year program report		
	- other___________________		
Review of SEA	- Consultant's visit reports	___	___
	- Compliance reports	___	___
	- Minimum program standards	___	___
	- other___________________	___	___
The SEA does not seek to verify the effect of the program or service upon the participant		___	___

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used by the SEA to verify the effectiveness of the program or service upon the participant's performance?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	- students	___	___
	- parents	___	___
	- administrators	___	___
	- vocational faculty	___	___
	- pupil support personnel	___	___
	- program advisory committee	___	___
	- other___________________	___	___
Personal interviews with	- students	___	___
	- parents	___	___
	- administrators	___	___
	- vocational faculty	___	___
	- pupil support personnel	___	___
	- program advisory committee	___	___
	- other___________________	___	___
Review of student	- records	___	___
	- test scores	___	___
	- drop-out rates	___	___
	- other___________________	___	___
Review of LEA	- 1 and 5 year Plans	___	___
	- Grant Application (RFP)	___	___
	- End of year program report	___	___
	- other___________________	___	___
Review of SEA	- Consultant's visit reports	___	___
	- Compliance reports	___	___
	- Minimum program standards	___	___
	- other___________________	___	___
The SEA does not seek to verify the effectiveness of the program or service upon the participant's performance in a vocational education program		___	___

COMMENTS CONCERNING CONTENT ANALYSIS:

5. Does the SEA evaluate the extent to which people involved in and affected by the program or service are in agreement with the adequacy, capacity and condition instructional resources available for use by participants?

___Yes ___No

IF YES: What evaluation strategy formats are used by the SEA to determine the availability of such resources to participants?

	Disadvantaged	Handicapped
LEA Self-evaluation using SEA developed instruments	___	___
LEA Self-evaluation using LEA developed instruments	___	___
External Evaluation Team using SEA developed instruments	___	___
External Evaluation Team using LEA developed instruments	___	___
External evaluation by an "expert" using SEA developed instruments	___	___
External evaluation by an "expert" using LEA developed instruments	___	___
Independent Third Party Evaluation using neither SEA or LEA instruments	___	___
Evaluation by State Consultant using SEA developed instruments	___	___
Evaluation by State Consultant using LEA developed instruments	___	___
Informal Evaluation by State Consultant using neither SEA or LEA instruments	___	___
Other______________________________	___	___

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used by the SEA to verify the extent of the availability of such resources to participants?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	- students	___	___
	- parents	___	___
	- administrators	___	___
	- vocational faculty	___	___
	- pupil support personnel	___	___
	- program advisory committee	___	___
	- other ________________	___	___
Personal interviews with	- students	___	___
	- parents	___	___
	- administrators	___	___
	- vocational faculty	___	___
	- pupil support personnel	___	___
	- program advisory committee	___	___
	- other ________________	___	___
Review of student	- records	___	___
	- test scores	___	___
	- drop-out ratios	___	___
	- other ________________	___	___
Review of LEA	- 1 and 5 year Plans	___	___
	- Grant Application (RFP)		
	- End of year program report		
	- other ________________		
Review of SEA	- Consultant's visit reports	___	___
	- Compliance reports	___	___
	- Minimum program standards	___	___
	- other ________________	___	___
The SEA does not seek to verify the extent of availability of such resoureces to participants		___	___

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used by the SEA to verify the effectiveness of such instructional resourses available for use by participants?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	- students	___	___
	- parents	___	___
	- administrators	___	___
	- vocational faculty	___	___
	- pupil support personnel	___	___
	- program advisory committee	___	___
	- other ___ ______________	___	___
Personal interviews with	- students	___	___
	- parents	___	___
	- administrators	___	___
	- vocational faculty	___	___
	- pupil support personnel	___	___
	- program advisory committee	___	___
	- other ________________	___	___
Review of student	- records	___	___
	- test scores	___	___
	- drop-out rates	___	___
	- other ________________	___	___
Review of LEA	- 1 and 5 year Plans	___	___
	- Grant Application (RFP)	___	___
	- End of year program report	___	___
	- other ________________	___	___
Review of SEA	- Consultant's visit reports	___	___
	- Compliance reports	___	___
	- Minimum program standards	___	___
	- other ________________	___	___
The SEA does not seek to verify the effectiveness of such resources available for use by participants		___	___

COMMENTS CONCERNING CONTENT ANALYSIS:

6. Does the SEA evaluate the extent to which the program or service is able to meet stated program or service goals?

___Yes ___No

IF YES: What evaluation strategy formats are used by the SEA to determine the extent to which program or service goals are being met?

	Disadvantaged	Handicapped
LEA Self-evaluation using SEA developed instruments	___	___
LEA Self-evaluation using LEA developed instruments	___	___
External Evaluation Team using SEA developed instruments	___	___
External Evaluation Team using LEA developed instruments	___	___
External evaluation by an "expert" using SEA developed instruments	___	___
External evaluation by an "expert" using LEA developed instruments	___	___
Independent Third Party Evaluation using neither SEA or LEA instruments	___	___
Evaluation by State Consultant using SEA developed instruments	___	___
Evaluation by State Consultant using LEA developed instruments	___	___
Informal Evaluation by State Consultant using neither SEA or LEA instruments	___	___
Other______________________	___	___

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used by the SEA to verify the extent to which program or service goals are being met?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	- students	___	___
	- parents	___	___
	- administrators	___	___
	- vocational faculty	___	___
	- pupil support personnel	___	___
	- program advisory committee	___	___
	- other______________	___	___
Personal interviews with	- students	___	___
	- parents	___	___
	- administrators	___	___
	- vocational faculty	___	___
	- pupil support personnel	___	___
	- program advisory committee	___	___
	- other______________	___	___
Review of student	- records	___	___
	- test scores	___	___
	- drop-out ratios	___	___
	- other______________	___	___
Review of LEA	- 1 and 5 year Plans	___	___
	- Grant Application (RFP)		
	- End of year program report		
	- other______________		
Review of SEA	- Consultant's visit reports	___	___
	- Compliance reports	___	___
	- Minimum program standards	___	___
	- other______________	___	___
The SEA does not seek to verify the extent to which the program or service goals are being met		___	___

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used by the SEA to verify the effectiveness of the program or service in meeting stated program or service goals?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	- students	___	___
	- parents	___	___
	- administrators	___	___
	- vocational facult	___	___
	- pupil support personnel	___	___
	- program advisory committee	___	___
	- other__________ ______	___	___
Personal interviews with	- students	___	___
	- parents	___	___
	- administrators	___	___
	- vocational facult	___	___
	- pupil support personnel	___	___
	- program advisory committee	___	___
	- other__________ ______	___	___
Review of student	- records	___	___
	- test scores	___	___
	- drop-out rates	___	___
	- other__________ ______	___	___
Review of LEA	- 1 and 5 year Plans	___	___
	- Grant Application (RFP)	___	___
	- End of year program report	___	___
	- other______________	___	___
Review of SEA	- Consultant's visit reports	___	___
	- Compliance reports	___	___
	- Minimum program standards	___	___
	- other______________	___	___
The SEA does not seek to verify the effectiveness of the program or service in meeting stated goals		___	___

COMMENTS CONCERNING CONTENT ANALYSIS:

7. Does the SEA evaluate how the project staff indentifies and records what actually takes place during the daily operation of the program or service?

___Yes ___No

IF YES: What evaluation strategy formats are used by the SEA to determine what actually takes place during the daily operation of the program or service?

	Disadvantaged	Handicapped
LEA Self-evaluation using SEA developed instruments	___	___
LEA Self-evaluation using LEA developed instruments	___	___
External Evaluation Team using SEA developed instruments	___	___
External Evaluation Team using LEA developed instruments	___	___
External evaluation by an "expert" using SEA developed instruments	___	___
External evaluation by an "expert" using LEA developed instruments	___	___
Independent Third Party Evaluation using neither SEA or LEA instruments	___	___
Evaluation by State Consultant using SEA developed instruments	___	___
Evaluation by State Consultant using LEA developed instruments	___	___
Informal Evaluation by State Consultant using neither SEA or LEA instruments	___	___
Other___________________	___	___

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used by the SEA to verify the extent to which staff actually record what takes place each day?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	- students	___	___
	- parents	___	___
	- administrators	___	___
	- vocational faculty	___	___
	- pupil support personnel	___	___
	- program advisory commitee	___	___
	- other_______________	___	___
Personal interviews with	- students	___	___
	- parents	___	___
	- administrators	___	___
	- vocational faculty	___	___
	- pupil support personnel	___	___
	- program advisory committee	___	___
	- other_______________	___	___
Review of student	- records	___	___
	- test scores	___	___
	- drop-out ratios	___	___
	- other_______________	___	___
Review of LEA	- 1 and 5 year Plans	___	___
	- Grant Application (RFP)		
	- End of year program report		
	- other_______________		
Review of SEA	- Consultant's visit reports	___	___
	- Compliance reports	___	___
	- Minimum program standards	___	___
	- other_______________	___	___
The SEA does not seek to verify what takes place each day of the program's operation		___	___

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used by the SEA to verify the effectiveness of the staff's recording of what actually takes place each day?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	- students	___	___
	- parents	___	___
	- administrators	___	___
	- vocational faculty	___	___
	- pupil support personnel	___	___
	- program advisory committee	___	___
	- other_______________	___	___
Personal interviews with	- students	___	___
	- parents	___	___
	- administrators	___	___
	- vocational faculty	___	___
	- pupil support personnel	___	___
	- program advisory committee	___	___
	- other_______________	___	___
Review of student	- records	___	___
	- test scores	___	___
	- drop-out rates	___	___
	- other_______________	___	___
Review of LEA	- 1 and 5 year Plans	___	___
	- Grant Application (RFP)	___	___
	- End of year program report	___	___
	- other_______________	___	___
Review of SEA	- Consultant's visit reports	___	___
	- Compliance reports	___	___
	- Minimum program standards	___	___
	- other_______________	___	___
The SEA does not seek to verify the effectiveness of the staff's recording of daily operations		___	___

COMMENTS CONCERNING CONTENT ANALYSIS:

8. Does the SEA evaluate how the LEA identifies and monitors on a continuous basis the potential of participants to succeed in their vocational program without the program or service?

___Yes ___No

IF YES: What evaluation strategy formats are used by the SEA to determine how the staff monitors participant's potential to succeed without the program or service?

	Disadvantaged	Handicapped
LEA Self-evaluation using SEA developed instruments	___	___
LEA Self-evaluation using LEA developed instruments	___	___
External Evaluation Team using SEA developed instruments	___	___
External Evaluation Team using LEA developed instruments	___	___
External evaluation by an "expert" using SEA developed instruments	___	___
External evaluation by an "expert" using LEA developed instruments	___	___
Independent Third Party Evaluation using neither SEA or LEA instruments	___	___
Evaluation by State Consultant using SEA developed instruments	___	___
Evaluation by State Consultant using LEA developed instruments	___	___
Informal Evaluation by State Consultant using neither SEA or LEA instruments	___	___
Other________________________	___	___

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used by the SEA to verify the continous staff monitoring of participant's potential to succeed with the program?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	- students	___	___
	- parents	___	___
	- administrators	___	___
	- vocational faculty	___	___
	- pupil support personnel	___	___
	- program advisory committee	___	___
	- other________________	___	___
Personal interviews with	- students	___	___
	- parents	___	___
	- administrators	___	___
	- vocational faculty	___	___
	- pupil support personnel	___	___
	- program advisory committee	___	___
	- other________________	___	___
Review of student	- records	___	___
	- test scores	___	___
	- drop-out ratios	___	___
	- other________________	___	___
Review of LEA	- 1 and 5 year Plans	___	___
	- Grant Application (RFP)		
	- End of year program report		
	- other________________		
Review of SEA	- Consultant's visit reports	___	___
	- Compliance reports	___	___
	- Minimum program standards	___	___
	- other________________	___	___
The SEA does not seek to verify the staff's monitoring of participant's potential		___	___

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used by the SEA to verify the effectiveness of staff's monitoring procedures to determine the potential of a participant's ability to succeed in a vocational program without the program or service?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	- students	___	___
	- parents	___	___
	- administrators	___	___
	- vocational faculty	___	___
	- pupil support personnel	___	___
	- program advisory committee	___	___
	- other________________	___	___
Personal interviews with	- students	___	___
	- parents	___	___
	- administrators	___	___
	- vocational faculty	___	___
	- pupil support personnel	___	___
	- program advisory committee	___	___
	- other________________	___	___
Review of student	- records	___	___
	- test scores	___	___
	- drop-out rates	___	___
	- other________________	___	___
Review of LEA	- 1 and 5 year Plans	___	___
	- Grant Application (RFP)	___	___
	- End of year program report	___	___
	- other________________	___	___
Review of SEA	- Consultant's visit reports	___	___
	- Compliance reports	___	___
	- Minimum program standards	___	___
	- other________________	___	___
The SEA does not seek to verify the effectiveness of staff's monitoring procedures		___	___

COMMENTS CONCERNING CONTENT ANALYSIS:

9. Does the SEA evaluate the extent to which people involved in and affected by the program or service believe the instructional offerings are available to disadvantaged and handicapped students?

___Yes ___No

IF YES: What evaluation strategy formats are used by the SEA to determine the extent to which the program or service is available?

	Disadvantaged	Handicapped
LEA Self-evaluation using SEA developed instruments	___	___
LEA Self-evaluation using LEA developed instruments	___	___
External Evaluation Team using SEA developed instruments	___	___
External Evaluation Team using LEA developed instruments	___	___
External evaluation by an "expert" using SEA developed instruments	___	___
External evaluation by an "expert" using LEA developed instruments	___	___
Independent Third Party Evaluation using neither SEA or LEA instruments	___	___
Evaluation by State Consultant using SEA developed instruments	___	___
Evaluation by State Consultant using LEA developed instruments	___	___
Informal Evaluation by State Consultant using neither SEA or LEA instruments	___	___
Other___________________________	___	___

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used by the SEA to verify the extent to which the program or service is available to students?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	- students	___	___
	- parents	___	___
	- administrators	___	___
	- vocational faculty	___	___
	- pupil support personnel	___	___
	- program advisory committee	___	___
	- other_______________	___	___
Personal interviews with	- students	___	___
	- parents	___	___
	- administrators	___	___
	- vocational faculty	___	___
	- pupil support personnel	___	___
	- program advisory committee	___	___
	- other_______________	___	___
Review of student	- records	___	___
	- test scores	___	___
	- drop-out ratios	___	___
	- other _______________	___	___
Review of LEA	- 1 and 5 year Plans	___	___
	- Grant Application (RFP)		
	- End of year program report		
	- other _______________		
Review of SEA	- Consultant's visit reports	___	___
	- Compliance reports	___	___
	- Minimum program standards	___	___
	- other _______________	___	___
The SEA does not seek to verify the extent to which the program or service is available		___	___

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used by the SEA to verify the effectiveness of the procedures used to make the program available to handicapped and disadvantaged students?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	- students	___	___
	- parents	___	___
	- administrators	___	___
	- vocational faculty	___	___
	- pupil support personnel	___	___
	- program advisory committee	___	___
	- other_______________ ___	___	___
Personal interviews with	- students	___	___
	- parents	___	___
	- administrators	___	___
	- vocational faculty	___	___
	- pupil support personnel	___	___
	- program advisory committee	___	___
	- other_______________ ___	___	___
Review of student	- records	___	___
	- test scores	___	___
	- drop-out rates	___	___
	- other_______________ ___	___	___
Review of LEA	- 1 and 5 year Plans	___	___
	- Grant Application (RFP)	___	___
	- End of year program report	___	___
	- other_______________	___	___
Review of SEA	- Consultant's visit reports	___	___
	- Compliance reports	___	___
	- Minimum program standards	___	___
	- other_______________	___	___
The SEA does not seek to verify the effectiveness of procedures used to make the program available		___	___

COMMENTS CONCERNING CONTENT ANALYSIS:

10. Does the SEA evaluate the extnet to which people involved in and affected by the program or service believe the instructional offerings available are appropriately matched with identified student needs?

___Yes ___No

IF YES: What evaluation strategy formats are used by the SEA to determine that such instructional offerings are appropriately matched with student needs?

	Disadvantaged	Handicapped
LEA Self-evaluation using SEA developed instruments	___	___
LEA Self-evaluation using LEA developed instruments	___	___
External Evaluation Team using SEA developed instruments	___	___
External Evaluation Team using LEA developed instruments	___	___
External evaluation by an "expert" using SEA developed instruments	___	___
External evaluation by an "expert" using LEA developed instruments	___	___
Independent Third Party Evaluation using neither SEA or LEA instruments	___	___
Evaluation by State Consultant using SEA developed instruments	___	___
Evaluation by State Consultant using LEA developed instruments	___	___
Informal Evaluation by State Consultant using neither SEA or LEA instruments	___	___
Other______________________	___	___

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used by the SEA to verify that the offerings available are appropriately matched with identified student needs?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	- students	___	___
	- parents	___	___
	- administrators	___	___
	- vocational faculty	___	___
	- pupil support personnel	___	___
	- program advisory committee	___	___
	- other________________	___	___
Personal interviews with	- students	___	___
	- parents	___	___
	- administrators	___	___
	- vocational faculty	___	___
	- pupil support personnel	___	___
	- program advisory committee	___	___
	- other________________	___	___
Review of student	- records	___	___
	- test scores	___	___
	- drop-out ratios	___	___
	- other________________	___	___
Review of LEA	- 1 and 5 year Plans	___	___
	- Grant Application (RFP)		
	- End of year program report		
	- other________________		
Review of SEA	- Consultant's visit reports	___	___
	- Compliance reports	___	___
	- Minimum program standards	___	___
	- other________________	___	___
The SEA does not seek to verify the matching of instruction based on student needs		___	___

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used by the SEA to verify the effectiveness of procedures used to match instructional offerings with student needs?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	- students	___	___
	- parents	___	___
	- administrators	___	___
	- vocational faculty	___	___
	- pupil support personnel	___	___
	- program advisory committee	___	___
	- other________________	___	___
Personal interviews with	- students	___	___
	- parents	___	___
	- administrators	___	___
	- vocational faculty	___	___
	- pupil support personnel	___	___
	- program advisory committee	___	___
	- other________________	___	___
Review of student	- records	___	___
	- test scores	___	___
	- drop-out rates	___	___
	- other________________	___	___
Review of LEA	- 1 and 5 year Plans	___	___
	- Grant Application (RFP)	___	___
	- End of year program report	___	___
	- other________________	___	___
Review of SEA	- Consultant's visit reports	___	___
	- Compliance reports	___	___
	- Minimum program standards	___	___
	- other________________	___	___
The SEA does not seek to verify the effectiveness of procedures used to match student needs with appropriate instruction		___	___

COMMENTS CONCERNING CONTENT ANALYSIS:

SECOND INTERNAL REVIEW

SECOND INTERNAL REVIEW

Comments of Reviewer #1	Action Taken
Delete Operational Process Instrument Question: "Does the SEA evaluate whether the program staff identifies and monitors on a continous basis the potential of participants to succeed in their respective vocational programs without the program? (hereafter referred to as Operational Process Instrument Question #8)	Noted by researcher
Delete Operational Process Instrument Question: "Does the SEA evaluate whether people involved in and affected by the program believe the instructional offerings are available to those disadvantaged and handicapped students most in need of the program? (hereafter referred to as Operational Process Instrument Question #9)	Noted by researcher

SECOND INTERNAL REVIEW

Comments of Reviewer #2	Action Taken
Delete Operational Process Instrument Question #8	Noted by researcher
Add to Operational Process Instrument the question: "Does the SEA evaluate whether the program has an appropriate teacher/pupil ratio?"	Question added
Add to Operational Process Instrument the question: "Does the SEA evalutate whether the program's instructor has the teacher qualifications to work with handicapped and/or disadvantaged persons?"	Question added
Add to Planning Process Instrument the question: "Does the SEA evaluate whether the LEA has established timelines for implementing major program goals and objectives?"	Question added
Restructure listing of strategy format possibilities to maximize potential combinations	Listing restructured
Develop letter code for possible answers to "If Yes" questions and highlight with a boxlike enclosure	Code developed & enclosed
Divide each phase of the content analysis sheet by boxing "If Yes" questions	Questions were enclosed

PROPOSED USE OF THIS INSTRUMENT

This instrument will be used for conducting a qualitative content analysis of documents used by state education agencies (SEAs) to evaluate the effectiveness of local education agency (LEA) vocational education programs for the handicapped and disadvantaged student.

MAJOR QUESTION OF THIS INSTRUMENT

What types of evaluation strategies are being used by SEAs to evaluate OPERATIONAL PROCESSES of LEA vocational education programs for the handicapped and disadvantaged student?

Prepared by
Jim Frasier

I have developed the questions listed below to identify whether SEA evaluation documents address the evaluation of program OPERATIONAL PROCESSES.

As you read these questions, will you please

1. critically review and comment on the appropriateness of each question's value in identifying program OPERATIONAL PROCESSES; and,
2. offer additional questions you think could be used to identify program OPERATIONAL PROCESSES.

---

1. Does the SEA evaluate whether the program has been implemented as originally planned?
2. Does the SEA evaluate whether people involved in and affected by the program are aware of the services provided by the program?
3. Does the SEA evaluate whether people involved in and affected by the program are aware of the services provided by the program?
4. Does the SEA evaluate whether people involved in and affected by the program are in agreement with the adequacy, capacity and/or condition of instructional resources available for use by participants?
5. Does the SEA evaluate whether the program is having an effect on the participants performance in their respective vocational education program?
6. Does the SEA evaluate whether the program has been able to meet stated program goals?
7. Does the SEA evaluate whether the project staff identifies and records what actually takes place during the daily operation of the program?
8. Does the SEA evaluate whether the program staff identifies and monitors on a continuous basis the potential of participants to succeed in their respective vocational programs without the program?
9. Does the SEA evaluate whether people involved in and affected by the program believe the instructional offerings are available to those disadvantaged and handicapped students most in need of the program?
10. Does the SEA evaluate whether people involved in and affected by the program believe the instructional offerings available are appropriately matched with identified student needs?

I will develop the same "If yes...then" instrument format to identify the types of evaluation strategies being used by SEAs to evaluate program OPERATIONAL PROCESSES.

As you review the questions on the opposite side of this page, will you please

1. substitute questions within the instrument format;
2. critically review and comment on the appropriateness of using the "If yes...then" format to identify OPERATIONAL PROCESSES; and,
3. if appropriate, offer an alternative format for use in identifying types of evaluation strategies using SEA evaluation documents.

gram or service is being impl
originally planned?

___Yes ___No

IF YES: What evaluation strategy formats are used by the SEA to determine if the program or service is being implemented as originally planned?

	Disadvantaged	Handicapped
LEA Self-evaluation using SEA developed instruments	___	___
LEA Self-evaluation using LEA developed instruments	___	___
External Evaluation Team using SEA developed instruments	___	___
External Evaluation Team using LEA developed instruments	___	___
External evaluation by an "expert" using SEA developed instruments	___	___
External evaluation by an "expert" using LEA developed instruments	___	___
Independent Third Party Evaluation using neither SEA or LEA instruments	___	___
Evaluation by State Consultant using SEA developed instruments	___	___
Evaluation by State Consultant using LEA developed instruments	___	___
Informal Evaluation by State Consultant using neither SEA or LEA instruments	___	___
Other______________________________	___	___

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used by the SEA to verify that the program or service is being implemented as planned?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	- students	___	___
	- parents	___	___
	- administrators	___	___
	- vocational faculty	___	___
	- pupil support personnel	___	___
	- program advisory committee	___	___
	- other__________________	___	___
Personal interviews with	- students	___	___
	- parents	___	___
	- administrators	___	___
	- vocational faculty	___	___
	- pupil support personnel	___	___
	- program advisory committee	___	___
	- other__________________	___	___
Review of student	- records	___	___
	- test scores	___	___
	- drop-out ratios	___	___
	- other__________________	___	___
Review of LEA	- 1 and 5 year Plans	___	___
	- Grant Application (RFP)		
	- End of year program report		
	- other__________________		
Review of SEA	- Consultant's visit reports	___	___
	- Compliance reports	___	___
	- Minimum program standards	___	___
	- other__________________	___	___
The SEA does not seek to verify if the program or service is being implemented as planned		___	___

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used by the SEA to verify the effe[illegible]ess of procedures used to implement the program or service?

		Disadvantaged	apped
Written survey of	- students	___	___
	- parents	___	___
	- administrators	___	___
	- vocational faculty	___	___
	- pupil support personnel	___	___
	- program advisory committee	___	___
	- other__________________	___	___
Personal interviews with	- students	___	___
	- parents	___	___
	- administrators	___	___
	- vocational faculty	___	___
	- pupil support personnel	___	___
	- program advisory committee	___	___
	- other__________________	___	___
Review of student	- records	___	___
	- test scores	___	___
	- drop-out rates	___	___
	- other__________________	___	___
Review of LEA	- 1 and 5 year Plans	___	___
	- Grant Application (RFP)	___	___
	- End of year program report	___	___
	- other__________________	___	___
Review of SEA	- Consultant's visit reports	___	___
	- Compliance reports	___	___
	- Minimum program standards	___	___
	- other__________________	___	___
The SEA does not seek to verify the effectiveness of procedures used to implement the program or service		___	___

COMMENTS CONCERNING CONTENT ANALYSIS:

PROPOSED USE OF THIS INSTRUMENT

This instrument will be used for conducting a qualitative content analysis of documents used by state education agencies (SEAs) to evaluate the effectiveness of local education agency (LEA) vocational education programs for the handicapped and disadvantaged student.

MAJOR QUESTION OF THIS INSTRUMENT

What types of evaluation strategies are being used by SEAs to evaluate the PLANNING PROCESSES of LEA vocational education programs for the handicapped and disadvantaged student?

Prepared by
Jim Frasier

I have developed the questions listed below to identify whether SEA evaluation documents address the evaluation of program PLANNING PROCESSES.

As you read these questions, will you please

1. critically review and comment on the appropriateness of each question's value in identifying program PLANNING PROCESSES; and,
2. offer additional questions you think could be used to identify program PLANNING PROCESSES.

---

1. Does the SEA evaluate efforts made by the LEA to utilize locally available handicapped/disadvantaged resources and/or services?
2. Does the SEA evaluate efforts made by the LEA program to identify students needing this program "in order to succeed in their vocational education program"?
3. Does the SEA evaluate whether the LEA program is serving only those handicapped/disadvantaged students unable to succeed in their vocational education program?
4. Does the SEA evaluate whether the LEA program assesses the unmet needs of each individual program participant?
5. Does the SEA evaluate whether individuals knowledgeable about the student (e.g. parents, teachers, counselors, special educators) are involved in assessment activities that seek to identify the student's unmet needs?
6. Does the SEA evaluate whether the unmet needs of individual students influence the formation of their respective program goals and objectives?
7. Does the SEA evaluate whether the unmet needs of individual students influence the formation of the LEA program's goals and objectives?
8. Does the SEA evaluate whether the student's vocational instructor is involved in the planning which develops goals and objectives for meeting the student's unmet needs?
9. Does the SEA evaluate whether individuals knowledgable about the needs of handicapped/disadvantaged students are involved in the planning which influences the formation of the LEA program's goals and objectives?

I have developed an "If yes...then" instrument format to identify the types of evaluation strategies being used by SEAs to evaluate program PLANNING PROCESSES.

As you review the questions on the opposite side of this page, will you please

1. substitute questions within the instrument format;
2. critically review and comment on the appropriateness of using the "If yes...then" format to identify PLANNING PROCESSES; and,
3. if appropriate, offer an alternative format for use in identifying types of evaluation strategies using SEA evaluation documents.

1. Does the SEA evaluate the need for the program or service by assessing the LEA's efforts to identify and utilize resources and services available in the school and community for handicapped & disadvantaged students?

___Yes ___No

IF YES: What evaluation strategy formats are used by the SEA to determine the LEA's efforts to identify and utilize such resources & services?

	Disadvantaged	Handicapped
LEA Self-evaluation using SEA developed instruments	___	___
LEA Self-evaluation using LEA developed instruments	___	___
External Evaluation Team using SEA developed instruments	___	___
External Evaluation Team using LEA developed instruments	___	___
External evaluation by an "expert" using SEA developed instruments	___	___
External evaluation by an "expert" using LEA developed instruments	___	___
Independent Third Party Evaluation using neither SEA or LEA instruments	___	___
Evaluation by State Consultant using SEA developed instruments	___	___
Evaluation by State Consultant using LEA developed instruments	___	___
Informal Evaluation by State Consultant using neither SEA or LEA instruments	___	___
Other______________________	___	___

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used by the SEA to verify LEA efforts to identify and utilize such resources and services?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	- students	___	___
	- parents	___	___
	- administrators	___	___
	- vocational faculty	___	___
	- pupil support personnel	___	___
	- program advisory committee	___	___
	- other______________	___	___
Personal interviews with	- students	___	___
	- parents	___	___
	- administrators	___	___
	- vocational faculty	___	___
	- pupil support personnel	___	___
	- program advisory committee	___	___
	- other______________	___	___
Review of student	- records	___	___
	- test scores	___	___
	- drop-out ratios	___	___
	- other______________	___	___
Review of LEA	- 1 and 5 year Plans	___	___
	- Grant Application (RFP)		
	- End of year program report		
	- other______________		
Review of SEA	- Consultant's visit reports	___	___
	- Compliance reports	___	___
	- Minimum program standards	___	___
	- other______________	___	___
The SEA does not seek to verify LEA efforts to identify & utilize such resources & services		___	___

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used by the SEA to verify the effectiveness of procedures used to identify such resources and sevices?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	- students	___	___
	- parents	___	___
	- administrators	___	___
	- vocational faculty	___	___
	- pupil support personnel	___	___
	- program advisory committee	___	___
	- other______________	___	___
Personal interviews with	- students	___	___
	- parents	___	___
	- administrators	___	___
	- vocational faculty	___	___
	- pupil support personnel	___	___
	- program advisory committee	___	___
	- other______________	___	___
Review of student	- records	___	___
	- test scores	___	___
	- drop-out rates	___	___
	- other______________	___	___
Review of LEA	- 1 and 5 year Plans	___	___
	- Grant Application (RFP)	___	___
	- End of year program report	___	___
	- other______________	___	___
Review of SEA	- Consultant's visit reports	___	___
	- Compliance reports	___	___
	- Minimum program standards	___	___
	- other______________	___	___
The SEA does not seek to verify the effectiveness of procedures used to identify & utilize such resources & services		___	___

COMMENTS CONCERNING CONTENT ANALYSIS:

EXTERNAL REVIEW PANEL

EXTERNAL REVIEW PANEL

Comments of Reviewer #1	Action Taken
Add to Operational Process Instrument a question about whether the goals and objectives planned to help the student succeed in a vocational program have been implemented by the program as planned	Question #5 added
Add to Operational Process Instrument a question about whether the parents and appropriate staff participated in implementation of the student's individualized program	Question #6 added
Reword in Planning Process Instrument Question #3 to focus on the efforts made by LEA's to identify those individuals in need of special services or programs	Question #3 reworded
Delete in Operational Process Instrument Question #8	Question #8 deleted
Delete in Operational Process Instrument Question #9	Question #9 deleted
Delete in Operational Process Instrument Question #12: "Does the SEA evaluate whether the program's instructor(s) has the necessary qualifications to work with H/D vocational students unmet needs?"	No action taken question formulated from PL 94-482 requirements

EXTERNAL REVIEW PANEL

Comments of Reviewer #1 (continued)	Action Taken
Expand format to identify reasons for why a particular content analysis indicator was not addressed by the SEA	No action (BSTS)
Identify time interval for how often the SEA addressed a content analysis indicator	No action (BSTS)
Establish the extent to which SEA evaluation practices have been established for implementing content analysis indicators	No action (BSTS)
Add to Operational Process Instrument questions which focus on whether the SEA had evaluated the appropriateness and effectiveness of LEA's due process procedures	No action (BSTS)
Add to Operational Process Instrument questions which focus on in-service needs activities provided to teachers	No action (BSTS)
Add to Planning Process Instrument a question which focuses on the planning processes used by LEA to establish individual IEP's for students	No action (BSTS)
Regroup questions in Planning Process Instrument to identify evaluation practices used by SEA's with students, parents, teachers or vocational instructors	No action (BSTS)

Note: (BSTS) =s Beyond Scope of The Study

EXTERNAL REVIEW PANEL

Comments of Reviewer #2	Action Taken
Question #1 in Operational Process Instrument: "Does the SEA evaluate whether the program has been implemented as originally planned?" is the same as Question #6: "Does the SEA evaluate whether the program has been able to meet stated program goals?", if you can assume that the original plan includes goals.	Question #6 deleted
Add to Question #1 in Operational Process Instrument: "...or an improvement over that which was planned."	Deleted the word "orginally" from Question #1
Indicated the phrase "people involved in and/or affected by" in Operational Process Instruments was "too vague".	No action taken-researcher intended to be non-categorical
Delete Question #7 in Operational Process Instrument: "Does the SEA evaluate whether the program staff identifies and records what actually takes place during the daily operation of the program?". This would require an inter-action analysis.	Question #7 deleted
Questioned how it would be possible to answer Operational Process Question #8	Question #8 deleted

EXTERNAL REVIEW PANEL

Comments of Reviewer #2 (Continued)	Action Taken
Question the significance of Operatinnal Process Question #9	Question #9 deleted
Questioned what would be an acceptable indicator that a teacher had the necessary qualifications to work with H/D students (Operational Process Instrument Question #12).	No action taken question formulated from PL 94-482 requirements
Reword Question #4 in Planning Process Instrument: "Does the SEA evaluate whether the LEA program is serving only those H/D students unable to succeed in their vocational education program?" to emphasize a program specifically designed to meet the needs of H/D students.	Question #4 reworded
Reword Question #7 in Planning Process Instrument: "Does the SEA evaluate whether the unmet needs of individual students influence the formation of their respective program goals and objectives?" to clearly identify meaning of "their".	Question #7 reworded
Operationally define "Planning Processes" and "Operational Processes"	No action taken - instrument indicators operationally define these processes
Add question(s) related to assure the unique requirments of H/D students have been met in Planning and Operational Processes Instruments.	No action taken (BSTS)

EXTERNAL REVIEW PANEL

Comments of Reviewer #3	Action Taken
No comments	N/A

INSTRUMENT B: OPERATIONAL PROCESSES

PROPOSED USE OF THIS INSTRUMENT

This instrument will be used for conducting a qualitative content analysis of documents used by state education agencies (SEAs) to evaluate the effectiveness of local education agency (LEA) vocational education programs for the handicapped and disadvantaged student.

The actual content analysis of SEA documents will be done by Jim Frasier. This instrument will not be mailed to a SEA nor will a SEA be requested to conduct a content analysis of evaluation documents using this instrument.

MAJOR QUESTION OF THIS INSTRUMENT

What types of evaluation strategies are being used by SEAs to evaluate the PLANNING PROCESSES of LEA vocational education programs for the handicapped and disadvantaged student?

Prepared by

James Frasier
Agricultural Engineering Bldg.
Dept. of Voc. Ed. & Technology
University of Vermont
Burlington, VT 05405

I have developed the questions listed below to identify whether SEA evaluation documents address the evaluation of program OPERATIONAL PROCESSES.

As you read these questions, will you please

1. critically review and comment on the appropriateness of each question's value in identifying program OPERATIONAL PROCESSES; and,
2. offer additional questions you think could be used to identify program OPERATIONAL PROCESSES.

1. Does the SEA evaluate whether the program has been implemented as originally planned?
2. Does the SEA evaluate whether people involved in and/or affected by the program are aware of the program's purpose(s)?
3. Does the SEA evaluate whether people involved in and/or affected by the program are aware of the services provided by the program?
4. Does the SEA evaluate whether people involved in and/or affected by the program are in agreement with the adequacy of instructional resources available for use by participants?
5. Does the SEA evaluate whether the program is having an effect on the participants' performance in their respective vocational education programs?
6. Does the SEA evaluate whether the program has been able to meet stated program goals?
7. Does the SEA evaluate whether the program staff identifies and records what actually takes place during the daily operation of the program?
8. Does the SEA evaluate whether the program staff monitors on a continuous basis the potential of participants to succeed in their respective vocational programs without the program?
9. Does the SEA evaluate whether people involved in and/or affected by the program believe the instructional offerings are available to those disadvantaged and handicapped students most in need of the program?
10. Does the SEA evaluate whether pople involved in and/or affected by the program believe the instructional offerings available are appropriately matched with identified student unmet needs?
11. Does the SEA evaluate whether the program has an appropriate teacher/pupil ratio to service the unmet needs of student participants?
12. Does the SEA evaluate whether the program's instructor(s) has the necessary teacher qualifications to work successfully with handicapped/disadvantaged vocational students' unmet needs?

The same "If Yes.....then" format used in the planning instrument will be developed to identify the types of evaluation strategies being used by SEAs to evaluate program OPERATIONAL PROCESSES.

As you review the questions on the opposite side of this page, will you please

1) substitute questions within the instrument format;
2) critically review and comment on the appropriateness of using the "If yes.....then" format to identify OPERATIONAL PROCESSES; and,
3) if appropriate, offer an alternative format for use in identifying types of evaluation strategies using SEA evaluation documents.

COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS:

1. Does the SEA evaluate whether LEA program goals and objectives have been implemented as planned?

___YES ___NO

IF YES: What SEA evaluation strategy formats are used to determine whether LEA program goals and objectives have been implemented as planned?

_____LEA Self-evaluation

_____External Evaluation Team

_____External Evaluation by an "expert"

_____Independent Third Party Evaluation

_____Evaluation by State Consultant

_____other____________________________

_____using LEA developed instruments

_____using SEA developed instruments

_____using neither SEA or LEA developed instruments

_____other____________________________

D =s used in evaluation of disadvantaged programs
H =s used in evaluation of handicapped programs
D/H =s used in evaluation of both programs

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify how LEA program goals and objectives have been implemented as planned?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	- students	____	____
	- parents	____	____
	-administrators	____	____
	-vocational faculty	____	____
	-pupil support personnel	____	____
	-program advisory committee	____	____
	-other____________________	____	____
Personal Interviews with	-students	____	____
	-parents	____	____
	-administrators	____	____
	-vocational faculty	____	____
	-pupil support personnel	____	____
	-program advisory committee	____	____
	-other____________________	____	____
Review of student	-records	____	____
	-test scores	____	____
	-drop-out ratios	____	____
	-other____________________	____	____
Review of LEA	-1 and 5 year plans	____	____
	-Grant Application (RFP)	____	____
	-End of year program report	____	____
	-other____________________	____	____
Review of SEA	-Consultant's visit reports	____	____
	-Compliance reports	____	____
	-Minimum program standards	____	____
	-other____________________	____	____

X =s YES ? =s UNCLEAR No Response =s Not present in document

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify the effectiveness of LEA program implementation of planned goals and objectives?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	-students	____	____
	-parents	____	____
	-administrators	____	____
	-vocational faculty	____	____
	-pupil support personnel	____	____
	-program advisory committee	____	____
	-other____________________	____	____
Personal interviews with	-students	____	____
	-parents	____	____
	-administrators	____	____
	-vocational faculty	____	____
	-pupil support personnel	____	____
	-program advisory committee	____	____
	-other____________________	____	____
Review of student	-records	____	____
	-test scores	____	____
	-drop-out ratios	____	____
	-other____________________	____	____
Review of LEA	-1 and 5 year plans	____	____
	-Grant Application (RFP)	____	____
	-End of year program report	____	____
	-other____________________	____	____
Review of SEA	-Consultant's visit reports	____	____
	-Compliance reports	____	____
	-Minimum program standards	____	____
	-other____________________	____	____

X =s YES ? =s UNCLEAR No Response =s Not present in Document

COMMENTS CONCERNING CONTENT ANALYSIS:

PROPOSED USE OF THIS INSTRUMENT

This instrument will be used for conducting a qualitative content analysis of documents used by state education agencies (SEAs) to evaluate the effectiveness of local education agency (LEA) vocational education programs for the handicapped and disadvantaged student.

The actual content analysis of SEA documents will be done by Jim Frasier. This instrument will not be mailed to a SEA nor will a SEA be requested to conduct a content analysis of evaluation documents using this instrument.

MAJOR QUESTION OF THIS INSTRUMENT

What types of evaluation strategies are being used by SEAs to evaluate OPERATIONAL PROCESSES of LEA vocational education programs for the handicapped and disadvantaged student?

Prepared by

James Frasier
Agricultural Engineering Building
Dept. of Voc. Ed. and Technology
University of Vermont
Burlington, VT 05405

I have developed the questions listed below to identify whether SEA evaluation documents address the evaluation of program PLANNING PROCESSES.

As you read these questions, will you please

1. critically review and comment on the appropriateness of each question's value in identifying program PLANNING PROCESSES; and,
2. offer additional questions you think could be used to identify program PLANNING PROCESSES.

1. Does the SEA evaluate whether the LEA has made efforts to identify locally available handicapped/disadvantaged resources and/or services?
2. Does the SEA evaluate efforts made by the LEA to utilize locally available handicapped/disadvantaged resources and/or services?
3. Does the SEA evaluate efforts made by the LEA program to identify students needing this program "in order to succeed in their vocational education program?
4. Does the SEA evaluate whether the LEA program is serving only those handicapped/disadvantaged students unable to succeed in their vocational education program?
5. Does the SEA evaluate whether the LEA program assesses the unmet needs of each individual program participant prior to providing services?
6. Does the SEA evaluate whether individuals knowledgeable about the student (e.g. parents, teachers, special educators) are involved in assessment activities that seek to identify the student's unmet needs prior to the program providing services?
7. Does the SEA evaluate whether the unmet needs of individual students influence the formation of their respective program goals and objectives?
8. Does the SEA evaluate whether the unmet needs of individual students influence the formation of the LEA program's goals and objectives?
9. Does the SEA evaluate whether the student's vocational instructor is involved in the planning which develops goals and objectives for meeting the student's unmet needs?
10. Does the SEA evaluate whether individuals knowledgeable about the needs of handicapped/disadvantaged students (handicapped/disadvantaged workers, advisory committee members) are involved in the planning which influences the formation of the LEA program's goals and objectives?
11. Does the SEA evaluate whether the LEA has established timelines for completing major program goals and objectives?
12. Does the SEA evaluate whether the LEA has a plan for implementing the program's goals and objectives?

I have developed an "If yes.....then" instrument format to identify the types of evaluation strategies being used by SEAs to evaluate program PLANNING PROCESSES.

As you review the content analysis instrument's format, will you please

1. critically review and comment on the appropriateness of the "If yes.....then" format; and,
2. if appropriate, offer an alternative format for use in identifying types of evaluation strategies using SEA evaluation documents.

COMMENTS AND SUGGESTIONS:

1. Does the SEA evaluate whethe, the LEA has made efforts to identify locally available handicapped/disadvantaged resources and/or services?

___YES ___NO

IF YES: What SEA evaluation strategy formats are used to determine whether the LEA has made efforts to identify locally available resources and/or services?

___LEA Self-evaluation

___External Evaluation Team

___External Evaluation by an "expert"

___Independent Third Party Evaluation

___Evaluation by State Consultant

___other___________________

___using LEA developed instruments

___using SEA developed instruments

___using neither SEA or LEA developed instruments

___other___________________

D =s used in evaluation of disadvantaged programs
H =s used in evaluation of handicapped programs
D/H =s used in evaluation of both programs

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify how the LEA has sought to identify such locally available resources and/or services?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	- students	___	___
	- parents	___	___
	-administrators	___	___
	-vocational faculty	___	___
	-pupil support personnel	___	___
	-program advisory committee	___	___
	-other___________	___	___
Personal Interviews with	-students	___	___
	-parents	___	___
	-administrators	___	___
	-vocational faculty	___	___
	-pupil support personnel	___	___
	-program advisory committee	___	___
	-other___________	___	___
Review of student	-records	___	___
	-test scores	___	___
	-drop-out ratios	___	___
	-other___________	___	___
Review of LEA	-1 and 5 year plans	___	___
	-Grant Application (RFP)	___	___
	-End of year program report	___	___
	-other___________	___	___
Review of SEA	-Consultant's visit reports	___	___
	-Compliance reports	___	___
	-Minimum program standards	___	___
	-other___________	___	___

X =s YES ? =s UNCLEAR No Response =s Not present in document

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify the effectiveness of LEA procedures to identify such locally available resources and/or services?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	-students	___	___
	-parents	___	___
	-administrators	___	___
	-vocational faculty	___	___
	-pupil support personnel	___	___
	-program advisory committee	___	___
	-other___________	___	___
Personal interviews with	-students	___	___
	-parents	___	___
	-administrators	___	___
	-vocational faculty	___	___
	-pupil support personnel	___	___
	-program advisory committee	___	___
	-other___________	___	___
Review of student	-records	___	___
	-test scores	___	___
	-drop-out ratios	___	___
	-other___________	___	___
Review of LEA	-1 and 5 year plans	___	___
	-Grant Application (RFP)	___	___
	-End of year program report	___	___
	-other___________	___	___
Review of SEA	-Consultant's visit reports	___	___
	-Compliance reports	___	___
	-Minimum program standards	___	___
	-other___________	___	___

X =s YES ? =s UNCLEAR No Response =s Not present in Document

COMMENTS CONCERNING CONTENT ANALYSIS:

APPENDIX E

THE CONTENT ANALYSIS INSTRUMENT
FOR
EVALUATION OF PLANNING PROCESSES

1. Does the SEA evaluate whether the LEA has made efforts to identify locally available handicapped/disadvantaged resources and/or services?

___YES ___NO

IF YES: What SEA evaluation strategy formats are used to determine whether the LEA has made efforts to identify locally available resources and/or services?

____LEA Self-evaluation

____External Evaluation Team

____External Evaluation by an "expert"

____Independent Third Party Evaluation

____Evaluation by State Consultant

____other________________________

____using LEA developed instruments

____using SEA developed instruments

____using neither SEA or LEA developed instruments

____other________________________

D =s used in evaluation of disadvantaged programs
H =s used in evaluation of handicapped programs
D/H =s used in evaluation of both programs

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify how the LEA has sought to identify such locally available resources and/or services?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	- students	____	____
	- parents	____	____
	-administrators	____	____
	-vocational faculty	____	____
	-pupil support personnel	____	____
	-program advisory committee	____	____
	-other____________	____	____
Personal Interviews with	-students	____	____
	-parents	____	____
	-administrators	____	____
	-vocational faculty	____	____
	-pupil support personnel	____	____
	-program advisory committee	____	____
	-other____________	____	____
Review of student	-records	____	____
	-test scores	____	____
	-drop-out ratios	____	____
	-other____________	____	____
Review of LEA	-1 and 5 year plans	____	____
	-Grant Application (RFP)	____	____
	-End of year program report	____	____
	-other____________	____	____
Review of SEA	-Consultant's visit reports	____	____
	-Compliance reports	____	____
	-Minimum program standards	____	____
	-other____________	____	____

X =s YES ? =s UNCLEAR No Response =s Not present in document

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify the effectiveness of LEA procedures to identify such locally available resources and/or services?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	-students	____	____
	-parents	____	____
	-administrators	____	____
	-vocational faculty	____	____
	-pupil support personnel	____	____
	-program advisory committee	____	____
	-other____________	____	____
Personal interviews with	-students	____	____
	-parents	____	____
	-administrators	____	____
	-vocational faculty	____	____
	-pupil support personnel	____	____
	-program advisory committee	____	____
	-other____________	____	____
Review of student	-records	____	____
	-test scores	____	____
	-drop-out ratios	____	____
	-other____________	____	____
Review of LEA	-1 and 5 year plans	____	____
	-Grant Application (RFP)	____	____
	-End of year program report	____	____
	-other____________	____	____
Review of SEA	-Consultant's visit reports	____	____
	-Compliance reports	____	____
	-Minimum program standards	____	____
	-other____________	____	____

X =s YES ? =s UNCLEAR No Response =s Not present in Document

COMMENTS CONCERNING CONTENT ANALYSIS:

2. Does the SEA evaluate efforts made by the LEA to utilize locally available handicapped/disadvantaged resources and/or services?

___YES ___NO

IF YES: What SEA evaluation strategy formats are used to determine whether the LEA has sought to utilize such resources and/or services?

____LEA Self-evaluation

____External Evaluation Team

____External Evaluation by an "expert"

____Independent Third Party Evaluation

____Evaluation by State Consultant

____other____________________

____using LEA developed instruments

____using SEA developed instruments

____using neither SEA or LEA developed instruments

____other____________________

D =s used in evaluation of disadvantaged programs
H =s used in evaluation of handicapped programs
D/H =s used in evaluation of both programs

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify how the LEA has made efforts to utilize such resources and/or services?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	- students	___	___
	- parents	___	___
	-administrators	___	___
	-vocational faculty	___	___
	-pupil support personnel	___	___
	-program advisory committee	___	___
	-other___________	___	___
Personal Interviews with	-students	___	___
	-parents	___	___
	-administrators	___	___
	-vocational faculty	___	___
	-pupil support personnel	___	___
	-program advisory committee	___	___
	-other___________	___	___
Review of student	-records	___	___
	-test scores	___	___
	-drop-out ratios	___	___
	-other___________	___	___
Review of LEA	-1 and 5 year plans	___	___
	-Grant Application (RFP)	___	___
	-End of year program report	___	___
	-other___________	___	___
Review of SEA	-Consultant's visit reports	___	___
	-Compliance reports	___	___
	-Minimum program standards	___	___
	-other___________	___	___

X =s YES ? =s UNCLEAR No Response =s Not present in document

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify the effectiveness of LEA procedures for utilizing such resources and/or services?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	-students	___	___
	-parents	___	___
	-administrators	___	___
	-vocational faculty	___	___
	-pupil support personnel	___	___
	-program advisory committee	___	___
	-other___________	___	___
Personal interviews with	-students	___	___
	-parents	___	___
	-administrators	___	___
	-vocational faculty	___	___
	-pupil support personnel	___	___
	-program advisory committee	___	___
	-other___________	___	___
Review of student	-records	___	___
	-test scores	___	___
	-drop-out ratios	___	___
	-other___________	___	___
Review of LEA	-1 and 5 year plans	___	___
	-Grant Application (RFP)	___	___
	-End of year program report	___	___
	-other___________	___	___
Review of SEA	-Consultant's visit reports	___	___
	-Compliance reports	___	___
	-Minimum program standards	___	___
	-other___________	___	___

X =s YES ? =s UNCLEAR No Response =s Not present in Document

COMMENTS CONCERNING CONTENT ANALYSIS:

3. Does the SEA evaluate efforts made by the LEA to identify those students in need of special services or programs in order to succeed in their vocational education programs?

___YES ___NO

IF YES: What SEA evaluation strategy formats are used to determine whether students needing the program are identified?

___LEA Self-evaluation

___External Evaluation Team

___External Evaluation by an "expert"

___Independent Third Party Evaluation

___Evaluation by State Consultant

___other______________________

___using LEA developed instruments

___using SEA developed instruments

___using neither SEA or LEA developed instruments

___other______________________

D =s used in evaluation of disadvantaged programs
H =s used in evaluation of handicapped programs
D/H =s used in evaluation of both programs

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify how the LEA determines that students needing the program are identified?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	- students	___	___
	- parents	___	___
	-administrators	___	___
	-vocational faculty	___	___
	-pupil support personnel	___	___
	-program advisory committee	___	___
	-other______________	___	___
Personal Interviews with	-students	___	___
	-parents	___	___
	-administrators	___	___
	-vocational faculty	___	___
	-pupil support personnel	___	___
	-program advisory committee	___	___
	-other______________	___	___
Review of student	-records	___	___
	-test scores	___	___
	-drop-out ratios	___	___
	-other______________	___	___
Review of LEA	-1 and 5 year plans	___	___
	-Grant Application (RFP)	___	___
	-End of year program report	___	___
	-other______________	___	___
Review of SEA	-Consultant's visit reports	___	___
	-Compliance reports	___	___
	-Minimum program standards	___	___
	-other______________	___	___

X =s YES ? =s UNCLEAR No Response =s Not present in document

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify the effectiveness of LEA procedures for identifying students needing the program?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	-students	___	___
	-parents	___	___
	-administrators	___	___
	-vocational faculty	___	___
	-pupil support personnel	___	___
	-program advisory committee	___	___
	-other______________	___	___
Personal interviews with	-students	___	___
	-parents	___	___
	-administrators	___	___
	-vocational faculty	___	___
	-pupil support personnel	___	___
	-program advisory committee	___	___
	-other______________	___	___
Review of student	-records	___	___
	-test scores	___	___
	-drop-out ratios	___	___
	-other______________	___	___
Review of LEA	-1 and 5 year plans	___	___
	-Grant Application (RFP)	___	___
	-End of year program report	___	___
	-other______________	___	___
Review of SEA	-Consultant's visit reports	___	___
	-Compliance reports	___	___
	-Minimum program standards	___	___
	-other______________	___	___

X =s YES ? =s UNCLEAR No Response =s Not present in Document

COMMENTS CONCERNING CONTENT ANALYSIS:

4. Does the SEA evaluate whether the LEA program is serving only those handicapped/disadvantaged students unable to succeed in their vocational education program?

___YES ___NO

IF YES: What SEA evaluation strategy formats are used to determine whether only such students are being served?

____LEA Self-evaluation

____External Evaluation Team

____External Evaluation by an "expert"

____Independent Third Party Evaluation

____Evaluation by State Consultant

____other________________________

____using LEA developed instruments

____using SEA developed instruments

____using neither SEA or LEA developed instruments

____other________________________

D =s used in evaluation of disadvantaged programs
H =s used in evaluation of handicapped programs
D/H =s used in evaluation of both programs

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify how the LEA determines that only such students are being served?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	- students		
	- parents		
	-administrators		
	-vocational faculty		
	-pupil support personnel		
	-program advisory committee		
	-other________		
Personal Interviews with	-students		
	-parents		
	-administrators		
	-vocational faculty		
	-pupil support personnel		
	-program advisory committee		
	-other________		
Review of student	-records		
	-test scores		
	-drop-out ratios		
	-other________		
Review of LEA	-1 and 5 year plans		
	-Grant Application (RFP)		
	-End of year program report		
	-other________		
Review of SEA	-Consultant's visit reports		
	-Compliance reports		
	-Minimum program standards		
	-other________		

X =s YES ? =s UNCLEAR No Response =s Not present in document

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify the effectiveness of LEA procedures for ensuring that only such students are being served?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	-students		
	-parents		
	-administrators		
	-vocational faculty		
	-pupil support personnel		
	-program advisory committee		
	-other________		
Personal interviews with	-students		
	-parents		
	-administrators		
	-vocational faculty		
	-pupil support personnel		
	-program advisory committee		
	-other________		
Review of student	-records		
	-test scores		
	-drop-out ratios		
	-other________		
Review of LEA	-1 and 5 year plans		
	-Grant Application (RFP)		
	-End of year program report		
	-other________		
Review of SEA	-Consultant's visit reports		
	-Compliance reports		
	-Minimum program standards		
	-other________		

X =s YES ? =s UNCLEAR No Response =s Not present in Document

COMMENTS CONCERNING CONTENT ANALYSIS:

5. Does the SEA evaluate whether the LEA program assesses the unmet needs of each individual program participant prior to providing services?

___YES ___NO

IF YES: What SEA evaluation strategy formats are used to determine whether the LEA assesses the unmet needs of each individual participant prior to providing services?

____LEA Self-evaluation

____External Evaluation Team

____External Evaluation by an "expert"

____Independent Third Party Evaluation

____Evaluation by State Consultant

____other____________________

____using LEA developed instruments

____using SEA developed instruments

____using neither SEA or LEA developed instruments

____other____________________

D =s used in evaluation of disadvantaged programs
H =s used in evaluation of handicapped programs
D/H =s used in evaluation of both programs

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify how the LEA assesses individual participant's unmet needs prior to providing services?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	- students		
	- parents		
	-administrators		
	-vocational faculty		
	-pupil support personnel		
	-program advisory committee		
	-other		
Personal Interviews with	-students		
	-parents		
	-administrators		
	-vocational faculty		
	-pupil support personnel		
	-program advisory committee		
	-other		
Review of student	-records		
	-test scores		
	-drop-out ratios		
	-other		
Review of LEA	-1 and 5 year plans		
	-Grant Application (RFP)		
	-End of year program report		
	-other		
Review of SEA	-Consultant's visit reports		
	-Compliance reports		
	-Minimum program standards		
	-other		

X =s YES ? =s UNCLEAR No Response =s Not present in document

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify the effectiveness of LEA procedures for assessing individual participant's unmet needs prior to providing services?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	-students		
	-parents		
	-administrators		
	-vocational faculty		
	-pupil support personnel		
	-program advisory committee		
	-other		
Personal interviews with	-students		
	-parents		
	-administrators		
	-vocational faculty		
	-pupil support personnel		
	-program advisory committee		
	-other		
Review of student	-records		
	-test scores		
	-drop-out ratios		
	-other		
Review of LEA	-1 and 5 year plans		
	-Grant Application (RFP)		
	-End of year program report		
	-other		
Review of SEA	-Consultant's visit reports		
	-Compliance reports		
	-Minimum program standards		
	-other		

X =s YES ? =s UNCLEAR No Response =s Not present in Document

COMMENTS CONCERNING CONTENT ANALYSIS:

6. Does the SEA evaluate whether individuals knowledgeable about the student (e.g. parents, teachers, special educators) are involved in assessment activities that seek to identify the student's unmet needs prior to the program providing services?

___YES ___NO

IF YES: What SEA evaluation strategy formats are used to determine whether such individuals are involved in assessment activities prior to the program providing services?

____LEA Self-evaluation

____External Evaluation Team

____External Evaluation by an "expert"

____Independent Third Party Evaluation

____Evaluation by State Consultant

____other________________________

____using LEA developed instruments

____using SEA developed instruments

____using neither SEA or LEA developed instruments

____other________________________

D =s used in evaluation of disadvantaged programs
H =s used in evaluation of handicapped programs
D/H =s used in evaluation of both programs

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify how the LEA involves such individuals in assessment activities prior to providing services?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	- students	____	____
	- parents	____	____
	-administrators	____	____
	-vocational faculty	____	____
	-pupil support personnel	____	____
	-program advisory committee	____	____
	-other________________	____	____
Personal Interviews with	-students	____	____
	-parents	____	____
	-administrators	____	____
	-vocational faculty	____	____
	-pupil support personnel	____	____
	-program advisory committee	____	____
	-other________________	____	____
Review of student	-records	____	____
	-test scores	____	____
	-drop-out ratios	____	____
	-other________________	____	____
Review of LEA	-1 and 5 year plans	____	____
	-Grant Application (RFP)	____	____
	-End of year program report	____	____
	-other________________	____	____
Review of SEA	-Consultant's visit reports	____	____
	-Compliance reports	____	____
	-Minimum program standards	____	____
	-other________________	____	____

X =s YES ? =s UNCLEAR No Response =s Not present in document

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify the effectiveness of LEA procedures for involving such individuals in assessment activities prior to providing services?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	-students	____	____
	-parents	____	____
	-administrators	____	____
	-vocational faculty	____	____
	-pupil support personnel	____	____
	-program advisory committee	____	____
	-other________________	____	____
Personal interviews with	-students	____	____
	-parents	____	____
	-administrators	____	____
	-vocational faculty	____	____
	-pupil support personnel	____	____
	-program advisory committee	____	____
	-other________________	____	____
Review of student	-records	____	____
	-test scores	____	____
	-drop-out ratios	____	____
	-other________________	____	____
Review of LEA	-1 and 5 year plans	____	____
	-Grant Application (RFP)	____	____
	-End of year program report	____	____
	-other________________	____	____
Review of SEA	-Consultant's visit reports	____	____
	-Compliance reports	____	____
	-Minimum program standards	____	____
	-other________________	____	____

X =s YES ? =s UNCLEAR No Response =s Not present in Document

COMMENTS CONCERNING CONTENT ANALYSIS:

7. Does the SEA evaluate whether the unmet needs of an individual student influence the student's program goals and objectives as a participant in the handicapped/disadvantaged program?

__ YES __NO

IF YES: What SEA evaluation strategy formats are used to determine whether the unmet needs of an individual student influence the student's program goals and objectives?

_____LEA Self-evaluation

_____External Evaluation Team

_____External Evaluation by an "expert"

_____Independent Third Party Evaluation

_____Evaluation by State Consultant

_____other_______________________

_____using LEA developed instruments

_____using SEA developed instruments

_____using neither SEA or LEA developed instruments

_____other_______________________

D =s used in evaluation of disadvantaged programs
H =s used in evaluation of handicapped programs
D/H =s used in evaluation of both programs

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify how the unmet needs of an individual student influence the student's program goals and objectives?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	- students		
	- parents		
	-administrators		
	-vocational faculty		
	-pupil support personnel		
	-program advisory committee		
	-other_______________		
Personal Interviews with	-students		
	-parents		
	-administrators		
	-vocational faculty		
	-pupil support personnel		
	-program advisory committee		
	-other_______________		
Review of student	-records		
	-test scores		
	-drop-out ratios		
	-other_______________		
Review of LEA	-1 and 5 year plans		
	-Grant Application (RFP)		
	-End of year program report		
	-other_______________		
Review of SEA	-Consultant's visit reports		
	-Compliance reports		
	-Minimum program standards		
	-other_______________		

X =s YES ? =s UNCLEAR No Response =s Not present in document

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify the effectiveness of LEA procedures for allowing the unmet needs of an individual student to influence the student's program and goals?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	-students		
	-parents		
	-administrators		
	-vocational faculty		
	-pupil support personnel		
	-program advisory committee		
	-other_______________		
Personal interviews with	-students		
	-parents		
	-administrators		
	-vocational faculty		
	-pupil support personnel		
	-program advisory committee		
	-other_______________		
Review of student	-records		
	-test scores		
	-drop-out ratios		
	-other_______________		
Review of LEA	-1 and 5 year plans		
	-Grant Application (RFP)		
	-End of year program report		
	-other_______________		
Review of SEA	-Consultant's visit reports		
	-Compliance reports		
	-Minimum program standards		
	-other_______________		

X =s YES ? =s UNCLEAR No Response =s Not present in Document

COMMENTS CONCERNING CONTENT ANALYSIS:

8. Does the SEA evaluate whether the unmet needs of individual students influence the formation of the LEA program's goals and objectives?

___YES ___NO

IF YES: What SEA evaluation strategy formats are used to determine whether the unmet needs of individual students influence the formation of the LEA program's goals and objectives?

____LEA Self-evaluation

____External Evaluation Team

____External Evaluation by an "expert"

____Independent Third Party Evaluation

____Evaluation by State Consultant

____other____________________

____using LEA developed instruments

____using SEA developed instruments

____using neither SEA or LEA developed instruments

____other____________________

D =s used in evaluation of disadvantaged programs
H =s used in evaluation of handicapped programs
D/H =s used in evaluation of both programs

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify how the unmet needs of individual students influence the formation of the LEA program's goals and objectives?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	- students		
	- parents		
	-administrators		
	-vocational faculty		
	-pupil support personnel		
	-program advisory committee		
	-other____________		
Personal Interviews with	-students		
	-parents		
	-administrators		
	-vocational faculty		
	-pupil support personnel		
	-program advisory committee		
	-other____________		
Review of student	-records		
	-test scores		
	-drop-out ratios		
	-other____________		
Review of LEA	-1 and 5 year plans		
	-Grant Application (RFP)		
	-End of year program report		
	-other____________		
Review of SEA	-Consultant's visit reports		
	-Compliance reports		
	-Minimum program standards		
	-other____________		

X =s YES ? =s UNCLEAR No Response =s Not present in document

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify the effectiveness of LEA procedures for enabling the unmet needs of individual students to influence the formation of the LEA program's goals and objectives?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	-students		
	-parents		
	-administrators		
	-vocational faculty		
	-pupil support personnel		
	-program advisory committee		
	-other____________		
Personal interviews with	-students		
	-parents		
	-administrators		
	-vocational faculty		
	-pupil support personnel		
	-program advisory committee		
	-other____________		
Review of student	-records		
	-test scores		
	-drop-out ratios		
	-other____________		
Review of LEA	-1 and 5 year plans		
	-Grant Application (RFP)		
	-End of year program report		
	-other____________		
Review of SEA	-Consultant's visit reports		
	-Compliance reports		
	-Minimum program standards		
	-other____________		

X =s YES ? =s UNCLEAR No Response =s Not present in Document

COMMENTS CONCERNING CONTENT ANALYSIS:

9. Does the SEA evaluate whether the student's vocational instructor is involved in the planning which develops goals and objectives for meeting the student's unmet needs?

___YES ___NO

IF YES: What SEA evaluation strategy formats are used to determine whether the vocational instructor is involved in such planning?

____LEA Self-evaluation

____External Evaluation Team

____External Evaluation by an "expert"

____Independent Third Party Evaluation

____Evaluation by State Consultant

____other__________________

____using LEA developed instruments

____using SEA developed instruments

____using neither SEA or LEA developed instruments

____other__________________

D =s used in evaluation of disadvantaged programs
H =s used in evaluation of handicapped programs
D/H =s used in evaluation of both programs

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify how the vocational instructor is involved in such planning?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	- students	___	___
	- parents	___	___
	-administrators	___	___
	-vocational faculty	___	___
	-pupil support personnel	___	___
	-program advisory committee	___	___
	-other__________	___	___
Personal Interviews with	-students	___	___
	-parents	___	___
	-administrators	___	___
	-vocational faculty	___	___
	-pupil support personnel	___	___
	-program advisory committee	___	___
	-other__________	___	___
Review of student	-records	___	___
	-test scores	___	___
	-drop-out ratios	___	___
	-other__________	___	___
Review of LEA	-1 and 5 year plans	___	___
	-Grant Application (RFP)	___	___
	-End of year program report	___	___
	-other__________	___	___
Review of SEA	-Consultant's visit reports	___	___
	-Compliance reports	___	___
	-Minimum program standards	___	___
	-other__________	___	___

X =s YES ? =s UNCLEAR No Response =s Not present in document

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify the effectiveness of LEA procedures for involving the vocational instructor in such planning?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	-students	___	___
	-parents	___	___
	-administrators	___	___
	-vocational faculty	___	___
	-pupil support personnel	___	___
	-program advisory committee	___	___
	-other__________	___	___
Personal interviews with	-students	___	___
	-parents	___	___
	-administrators	___	___
	-vocational faculty	___	___
	-pupil support personnel	___	___
	-program advisory committee	___	___
	-other__________	___	___
Review of student	-records	___	___
	-test scores	___	___
	-drop-out ratios	___	___
	-other__________	___	___
Review of LEA	-1 and 5 year plans	___	___
	-Grant Application (RFP)	___	___
	-End of year program report	___	___
	-other__________	___	___
Review of SEA	-Consultant's visit reports	___	___
	-Compliance reports	___	___
	-Minimum program standards	___	___
	-other__________	___	___

X =s YES ? =s UNCLEAR No Response =s Not present in Document

COMMENTS CONCERNING CONTENT ANALYSIS:

10. Does the SEA evaluate whether individuals knowledgeable about the needs of handicapped/disadvantaged students (handicapped/disadvantaged workers, advisory committee members) are involved in the planning which influences the formation of the LEA program's goals and objectives?

___YES ___NO

IF YES: What SEA evaluation strategy formats are used to determine whether such individuals are involved in the planning of LEA program goals and objectives?

_____LEA Self-evaluation

_____External Evaluation Team

_____External Evaluation by an "expert"

_____Independent Third Party Evaluation

_____Evaluation by State Consultant

_____other____________________________

_____using LEA developed instruments

_____using SEA developed instruments

_____using neither SEA or LEA developed instruments

_____other____________________________

D =s used in evaluation of disadvantaged programs
H =s used in evaluation of handicapped programs
D/H =s used in evaluation of both programs

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify how such individuals are involved in the planning of LEA program goals and objectives?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	- students	____	____
	- parents	____	____
	-administrators	____	____
	-vocational faculty	____	____
	-pupil support personnel	____	____
	-program advisory committee	____	____
	-other________________	____	____
Personal Interviews with	-students	____	____
	-parents	____	____
	-administrators	____	____
	-vocational faculty	____	____
	-pupil support personnel	____	____
	-program advisory committee	____	____
	-other________________	____	____
Review of student	-records	____	____
	-test scores	____	____
	-drop-out ratios	____	____
	-other________________	____	____
Review of LEA	-1 and 5 year plans	____	____
	-Grant Application (RFP)	____	____
	-End of year program report	____	____
	-other________________	____	____
Review of SEA	-Consultant's visit reports	____	____
	-Compliance reports	____	____
	-Minimum program standards	____	____
	-other________________	____	____

X =s YES ? =s UNCLEAR No Response =s Not present in document

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify the effectiveness of LEA procedures for involving such individuals in the planning of the LEA program's goals and objectives?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	-students	____	____
	-parents	____	____
	-administrators	____	____
	-vocational faculty	____	____
	-pupil support personnel	____	____
	-program advisory committee	____	____
	-other________________	____	____
Personal interviews with	-students	____	____
	-parents	____	____
	-administrators	____	____
	-vocational faculty	____	____
	-pupil support personnel	____	____
	-program advisory committee	____	____
	-other________________	____	____
Review of student	-records	____	____
	-test scores	____	____
	-drop-out ratios	____	____
	-other________________	____	____
Review of LEA	-1 and 5 year plans	____	____
	-Grant Application (RFP)	____	____
	-End of year program report	____	____
	-other________________	____	____
Review of SEA	-Consultant's visit reports	____	____
	-Compliance reports	____	____
	-Minimum program standards	____	____
	-other________________	____	____

X =s YES ? =s UNCLEAR No Response =s Not present in Document

COMMENTS CONCERNING CONTENT ANALYSIS:

11. Does the SEA evaluate whether the LEA has established timelines for completing major program goals and objectives?

___YES ___NO

IF YES: What SEA evaluation strategy formats are used to determine whether the LEA has established timelines for completing major program goals and objectives?

____LEA Self-evaluation

____External Evaluation Team

____External Evaluation by an "expert"

____Independent Third Party Evaluation

____Evaluation by State Consultant

____other________________________

____using LEA developed instruments

____using SEA developed instruments

____using neither SEA or LEA developed instruments

____other________________________

D =s used in evaluation of disadvantaged programs
H =s used in evaluation of handicapped programs
D/H =s used in evaluation of both programs

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify how the LEA established timelines for completing major program goals and objectives?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	- students	___	___
	- parents	___	___
	-administrators	___	___
	-vocational faculty	___	___
	-pupil support personnel	___	___
	-program advisory committee	___	___
	-other______________	___	___
Personal Interviews with	-students	___	___
	-parents	___	___
	-administrators	___	___
	-vocational faculty	___	___
	-pupil support personnel	___	___
	-program advisory committee	___	___
	-other______________	___	___
Review of student	-records	___	___
	-test scores	___	___
	-drop-out ratios	___	___
	-other______________	___	___
Review of LEA	-1 and 5 year plans	___	___
	-Grant Application (RFP)	___	___
	-End of year program report	___	___
	-other______________	___	___
Review of SEA	-Consultant's visit reports	___	___
	-Compliance reports	___	___
	-Minimum program standards	___	___
	-other______________	___	___

X =s YES ? =s UNCLEAR No Response =s Not present in document

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify the effectiveness of LEA procedures for establishing timelines to complete major program goals and objectives?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	-students	___	___
	-parents	___	___
	-administrators	___	___
	-vocational faculty	___	___
	-pupil support personnel	___	___
	-program advisory committee	___	___
	-other______________	___	___
Personal interviews with	-students	___	___
	-parents	___	___
	-administrators	___	___
	-vocational faculty	___	___
	-pupil support personnel	___	___
	-program advisory committee	___	___
	-other______________	___	___
Review of student	-records	___	___
	-test scores	___	___
	-drop-out ratios	___	___
	-other______________	___	___
Review of LEA	-1 and 5 year plans	___	___
	-Grant Application (RFP)	___	___
	-End of year program report	___	___
	-other______________	___	___
Review of SEA	-Consultant's visit reports	___	___
	-Compliance reports	___	___
	-Minimum program standards	___	___
	-other______________	___	___

X =s YES ? =s UNCLEAR No Response =s Not present in Document

COMMENTS CONCERNING CONTENT ANALYSIS:

12. Does the SEA evaluate whether the LEA has a plan for implementing program goals and objectives?

___YES ___NO

IF YES: What SEA evaluation strategy formats are used to determine whether the LEA has a plan for implementing program goals and objectives?

___LEA Self-evaluation

___External Evaluation Team

___External Evaluation by an "expert"

___Independent Third Party Evaluation

___Evaluation by State Consultant

___other______________________

___using LEA developed instruments

___using SEA developed instruments

___using neither SEA or LEA developed instruments

___other______________________

D =s used in evaluation of disadvantaged programs
H =s used in evaluation of handicapped programs
D/H =s used in evaluation of both programs

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify that the LEA has a plan for implementing program goals and objectives?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	- students	___	___
	- parents	___	___
	-administrators	___	___
	-vocational faculty	___	___
	-pupil support personnel	___	___
	-program advisory committee	___	___
	-other______________	___	___
Personal Interviews with	-students	___	___
	-parents	___	___
	-administrators	___	___
	-vocational faculty	___	___
	-pupil support personnel	___	___
	-program advisory committee	___	___
	-other______________	___	___
Review of student	-records	___	___
	-test scores	___	___
	-drop-out ratios	___	___
	-other______________	___	___
Review of LEA	-1 and 5 year plans	___	___
	-Grant Application (RFP)	___	___
	-End of year program report	___	___
	-other______________	___	___
Review of SEA	-Consultant's visit reports	___	___
	-Compliance reports	___	___
	-Minimum program standards	___	___
	-other______________	___	___

X =s YES ? =s UNCLEAR No Response =s Not present in document

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify the effectiveness of the LEA's plan for implementing program goals and objectives?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	-students	___	___
	-parents	___	___
	-administrators	___	___
	-vocational faculty	___	___
	-pupil support personnel	___	___
	-program advisory committee	___	___
	-other______________	___	___
Personal interviews with	-students	___	___
	-parents	___	___
	-administrators	___	___
	-vocational faculty	___	___
	-pupil support personnel	___	___
	-program advisory committee	___	___
	-other______________	___	___
Review of student	-records	___	___
	-test scores	___	___
	-drop-out ratios	___	___
	-other______________	___	___
Review of LEA	-1 and 5 year plans	___	___
	-Grant Application (RFP)	___	___
	-End of year program report	___	___
	-other______________	___	___
Review of SEA	-Consultant's visit reports	___	___
	-Compliance reports	___	___
	-Minimum program standards	___	___
	-other______________	___	___

X =s YES ? =s UNCLEAR No Response =s Not present in Document

COMMENTS CONCERNING CONTENT ANALYSIS:

APPENDIX F

THE CONTENT ANALYSIS INSTRUMENT
FOR
EVALUATION OF OPERATIONAL PROCESSES

1. Does the SEA evaluate whether LEA program goals and objectives have been implemented as planned?

___YES ___NO

IF YES: What SEA evaluation strategy formats are used to determine whether LEA program goals and objectives have been implemented as planned?

____LEA Self-evaluation

____External Evaluation Team

____External Evaluation by an "expert"

____Independent Third Party Evaluation

____Evaluation by State Consultant

____other________________________

____using LEA developed instruments

____using SEA developed instruments

____using neither SEA or LEA developed instruments

____other________________________

D =s used in evaluation of disadvantaged programs
H =s used in evaluation of handicapped programs
D/H =s used in evaluation of both programs

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify how LEA program goals and objectives have been implemented as planned?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	- students	____	____
	- parents	____	____
	-administrators	____	____
	-vocational faculty	____	____
	-pupil support personnel	____	____
	-program advisory committee	____	____
	-other________________	____	____
Personal Interviews with	-students	____	____
	-parents	____	____
	-administrators	____	____
	-vocational faculty	____	____
	-pupil support personnel	____	____
	-program advisory committee	____	____
	-other________________	____	____
Review of student	-records	____	____
	-test scores	____	____
	-drop-out ratios	____	____
	-other________________	____	____
Review of LEA	-1 and 5 year plans	____	____
	-Grant Application (RFP)	____	____
	-End of year program report	____	____
	-other________________	____	____
Review of SEA	-Consultant's visit reports	____	____
	-Compliance reports	____	____
	-Minimum program standards	____	____
	-other________________	____	____

X =s YES ? =s UNCLEAR No Response =s Not present in document

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify the effectiveness of LEA program implementation of planned goals and objectives?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	-students	____	____
	-parents	____	____
	-administrators	____	____
	-vocational faculty	____	____
	-pupil support personnel	____	____
	-program advisory committee	____	____
	-other________________	____	____
Personal interviews with	-students	____	____
	-parents	____	____
	-administrators	____	____
	-vocational faculty	____	____
	-pupil support personnel	____	____
	-program advisory committee	____	____
	-other________________	____	____
Review of student	-records	____	____
	-test scores	____	____
	-drop-out ratios	____	____
	-other________________	____	____
Review of LEA	-1 and 5 year plans	____	____
	-Grant Application (RFP)	____	____
	-End of year program report	____	____
	-other________________	____	____
Review of SEA	-Consultant's visit reports	____	____
	-Compliance reports	____	____
	-Minimum program standards	____	____
	-other________________	____	____

X =s YES ? =s UNCLEAR No Response =s Not present in Document

COMMENTS CONCERNING CONTENT ANALYSIS:

2. Does the SEA evaluate whether people involved in and/or affected by the program are aware of the program's purpose(s)?

___YES ___NO

IF YES: What SEA evaluation strategy formats are used to determine whether people involved in and/or affected by the program are aware of the program's purpose(s)?

____LEA Self-evaluation

____External Evaluation Team

____External Evaluation by an "expert"

____Independent Third Party Evaluation

____Evaluation by State Consultant

____other____________________

____using LEA developed instruments

____using SEA developed instruments

____using neither SEA or LEA developed instruments

____other____________________

D =s used in evaluation of disadvantaged programs
H =s used in evaluation of handicapped programs
D/H =s used in evaluation of both programs

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify how people involed in and/or affected by the program are aware of the program's purpose(s)?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	- students	____	____
	- parents	____	____
	-administrators	____	____
	-vocational faculty	____	____
	-pupil support personnel	____	____
	-program advisory committee	____	____
	-other ____________	____	____
Personal Interviews with	-students	____	____
	-parents	____	____
	-administrators	____	____
	-vocational faculty	____	____
	-pupil support personnel	____	____
	-program advisory committee	____	____
	-other ____________	____	____
Review of student	-records	____	____
	-test scores	____	____
	-drop-out ratios	____	____
	-other ____________	____	____
Review of LEA	-1 and 5 year plans	____	____
	-Grant Application (RFP)	____	____
	-End of year program report	____	____
	-other ____________	____	____
Review of SEA	-Consultant's visit reports	____	____
	-Compliance reports	____	____
	-Minimum program standards	____	____
	-other ____________	____	____

X =s YES ? =s UNCLEAR No Response =s Not present in document

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify the effectiveness of the LEA program to determine the awareness of people about the program's purposes?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	-students	____	____
	-parents	____	____
	-administrators	____	____
	-vocational faculty	____	____
	-pupil support personnel	____	____
	-program advisory committee	____	____
	-other ____________	____	____
Personal interviews with	-students	____	____
	-parents	____	____
	-administrators	____	____
	-vocational faculty	____	____
	-pupil support personnel	____	____
	-program advisory committee	____	____
	-other ____________	____	____
Review of student	-records	____	____
	-test scores	____	____
	-drop-out ratios	____	____
	-other ____________	____	____
Review of LEA	-1 and 5 year plans	____	____
	-Grant Application (RFP)	____	____
	-End of year program report	____	____
	-other ____________	____	____
Review of SEA	-Consultant's visit reports	____	____
	-Compliance reports	____	____
	-Minimum program standards	____	____
	-other ____________	____	____

X =s YES ? =s UNCLEAR No Response =s Not present in Document

COMMENTS CONCERNING CONTENT ANALYSIS:

3. Does the SEA evaluate whether people involved in and/or affected by the program are aware of the services provided by the program?

___YES ___NO

IF YES: What SEA evaluation strategy formats are used to determine whether people involved in and/or affected by the program are aware of the services provided by the program?

____LEA Self-evaluation

____External Evaluation Team

____External Evaluation by an "expert"

____Independent Third Party Evaluation

____Evaluation by State Consultant

____other____________________

____using LEA developed instruments

____using SEA developed instruments

____using neither SEA or LEA developed instruments

____other____________________

D =s used in evaluation of disadvantaged programs
H =s used in evaluation of handicapped programs
D/H =s used in evaluation of both programs

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify how people involved in and/or affected by the program are aware of the services provided by the program?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	- students	___	___
	- parents	___	___
	-administrators	___	___
	-vocational faculty	___	___
	-pupil support personnel	___	___
	-program advisory committee	___	___
	-other____________	___	___
Personal Interviews with	-students	___	___
	-parents	___	___
	-administrators	___	___
	-vocational faculty	___	___
	-pupil support personnel	___	___
	-program advisory committee	___	___
	-other____________	___	___
Review of student	-records	___	___
	-test scores	___	___
	-drop-out ratios	___	___
	-other____________	___	___
Review of LEA	-1 and 5 year plans	___	___
	-Grant Application (RFP)	___	___
	-End of year program report	___	___
	-other____________	___	___
Review of SEA	-Consultant's visit reports	___	___
	-Compliance reports	___	___
	-Minimum program standards	___	___
	-other____________	___	___

X =s YES ? =s UNCLEAR No Response =s Not present in document

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify the effectiveness of the LEA program to determine the awareness of people about the services provided by this program?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	-students	___	___
	-parents	___	___
	-administrators	___	___
	-vocational faculty	___	___
	-pupil support personnel	___	___
	-program advisory committee	___	___
	-other____________	___	___
Personal interviews with	-students	___	___
	-parents	___	___
	-administrators	___	___
	-vocational faculty	___	___
	-pupil support personnel	___	___
	-program advisory committee	___	___
	-other____________	___	___
Review of student	-records	___	___
	-test scores	___	___
	-drop-out ratios	___	___
	-other____________	___	___
Review of LEA	-1 and 5 year plans	___	___
	-Grant Application (RFP)	___	___
	-End of year program report	___	___
	-other____________	___	___
Review of SEA	-Consultant's visit reports	___	___
	-Compliance reports	___	___
	-Minimum program standards	___	___
	-other____________	___	___

X =s YES ? =s UNCLEAR No Response =s Not present in Document

COMMENTS CONCERNING CONTENT ANALYSIS:

4. Does the SEA evaluate whether people involved in and/or affected by the program are in agreement with the adequacy of instructional resources available for use by the participants?

___YES ___NO

IF YES: What SEA evaluation strategy formats are used to determine whether people involved in and/or affected by the program are in agreement with the adequacy of instructional resources available for use by the participants?

____LEA Self-evaluation	____using LEA developed instruments
____External Evaluation Team	____using SEA developed instruments
____External Evaluation by an "expert"	____using neither SEA or LEA developed instruments
____Independent Third Party Evaluation	____other________________
____Evaluation by State Consultant	
____other________________	

D =s used in evaluation of disadvantaged programs
H =s used in evaluation of handicapped programs
D/H =s used in evaluation of both programs

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify how the instructional resources available for use by participants are adequate?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	- students	____	____
	- parents	____	____
	-administrators	____	____
	-vocational faculty	____	____
	-pupil support personnel	____	____
	-program advisory committee	____	____
	-other________	____	____
Personal interviews with	-students	____	____
	-parents	____	____
	-administrators	____	____
	-vocational faculty	____	____
	-pupil support personnel	____	____
	-program advisory committee	____	____
	-other________	____	____
Review of student	-records	____	____
	-test scores	____	____
	-drop-out ratios	____	____
	-other________	____	____
Review of LEA	-1 and 5 year plans	____	____
	-Grant Application (RFP)	____	____
	-End of year program report	____	____
	-other________	____	____
Review of SEA	-Consultant's visit reports	____	____
	-Compliance reports	____	____
	-Minimum program standards	____	____
	-other________	____	____

X =s YES ? =s UNCLEAR No Response =s Not present in document

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify the effectiveness of LEA program instructional resources available for use by the participants?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	-students	____	____
	-parents	____	____
	-administrators	____	____
	-vocational faculty	____	____
	-pupil support personnel	____	____
	-program advisory committee	____	____
	-other________	____	____
Personal interviews with	-students	____	____
	-parents	____	____
	-administrators	____	____
	-vocational faculty	____	____
	-pupil support personnel	____	____
	-program advisory committee	____	____
	-other________	____	____
Review of student	-records	____	____
	-test scores	____	____
	-drop-out ratios	____	____
	-other________	____	____
Review of LEA	-1 and 5 year plans	____	____
	-Grant Application (RFP)	____	____
	-End of year program report	____	____
	-other________	____	____
Review of SEA	-Consultant's visit reports	____	____
	-Compliance reports	____	____
	-Minimum program standards	____	____
	-other________	____	____

X =s YES ? =s UNCLEAR No Response =s Not present in Document

COMMENTS CONCERNING CONTENT ANALYSIS:

5. Does the SEA evaluate whether the goals and objectives planned to help the student succeed in a vocational program have been implemented by the program as planned?

___YES ___NO

IF YES: What SEA evaluation strategy formats are used to determine whether the goals and objectives planned to help the student succeed in a vocational program have been implemented by the program as planned?

____LEA Self-evaluation

____External Evaluation Team

____External Evaluation by an "expert"

____Independent Third Party Evaluation

____Evaluation by State Consultant

____other ____________________

____using LEA developed instruments

____using SEA developed instruments

____using neither SEA or LEA developed instruments

____other ____________________

D =s used in evaluation of disadvantaged programs
H =s used in evaluation of handicapped programs
D/H =s used in evaluation of both programs

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify how goals and objectives planned to help the student succeed in a vocational program have been implemented by the program as planned?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	- students	____	____
	- parents	____	____
	-administrators	____	____
	-vocational faculty	____	____
	-pupil support personnel	____	____
	-program advisory committee	____	____
	-other ____________	____	____
Personal Interviews with	-students	____	____
	-parents	____	____
	-administrators	____	____
	-vocational faculty	____	____
	-pupil support personnel	____	____
	-program advisory committee	____	____
	-other ____________	____	____
Review of student	-records	____	____
	-test scores	____	____
	-drop-out ratios	____	____
	-other ____________	____	____
Review of LEA	-1 and 5 year plans	____	____
	-Grant Application (RFP)	____	____
	-End of year program report	____	____
	-other ____________	____	____
Review of SEA	-Consultant's visit reports	____	____
	-Compliance reports	____	____
	-Minimum program standards	____	____
	-other ____________	____	____

X =s YES ? =s UNCLEAR No Response =s Not present in document

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify the effectiveness of the LEA program's implementation of goals and objectives planned to help the student succeed in a vocational program?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	-students	____	____
	-parents	____	____
	-administrators	____	____
	-vocational faculty	____	____
	-pupil support personnel	____	____
	-program advisory committee	____	____
	-other ____________	____	____
Personal interviews with	-students	____	____
	-parents	____	____
	-administrators	____	____
	-vocational faculty	____	____
	-pupil support personnel	____	____
	-program advisory committee	____	____
	-other ____________	____	____
Review of student	-records	____	____
	-test scores	____	____
	-drop-out ratios	____	____
	-other ____________	____	____
Review of LEA	-1 and 5 year plans	____	____
	-Grant Application (RFP)	____	____
	-End of year program report	____	____
	-other ____________	____	____
Review of SEA	-Consultant's visit reports	____	____
	-Compliance reports	____	____
	-Minimum program standards	____	____
	-other ____________	____	____

X =s YES ? =s UNCLEAR No Response =s Not present in Document

COMMENTS CONCERNING CONTENT ANALYSIS:

6. Does the SEA evaluate whether the vocational instructor has participated in the implementation of program goals and objectives planned to help the student succeed in a vocational program?

___YES ___NO

IF YES: What SEA evaluation strategy formats are used to determine whether the vocational instructor has participated in the implementation of program goals and objectives planned to help the student succeed in a vocational program?

____LEA Self-evaluation

____External Evaluation Team

____External Evaluation by an "expert"

____Independent Third Party Evaluation

____Evaluation by State Consultant

____other____________________

____using LEA developed instruments

____using SEA developed instruments

____using neither SEA or LEA developed instruments

____other____________________

D =s used in evaluation of disadvantaged programs
H =s used in evaluation of handicapped programs
D/H =s used in evaluation of both programs

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify how the vocational instructor has participated in the implementation of program goals and objectives planned to help the student succeed in a vocational program?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	- students	____	____
	- parents	____	____
	-administrators	____	____
	-vocational faculty	____	____
	-pupil support personnel	____	____
	-program advisory committee	____	____
	-other____________	____	____
Personal Interviews with	-students	____	____
	-parents	____	____
	-administrators	____	____
	-vocational faculty	____	____
	-pupil support personnel	____	____
	-program advisory committee	____	____
	-other____________	____	____
Review of student	-records	____	____
	-test scores	____	____
	-drop-out ratios	____	____
	-other____________	____	____
Review of LEA	-1 and 5 year plans	____	____
	-Grant Application (RFP)	____	____
	-End of year program report	____	____
	-other____________	____	____
Review of SEA	-Consultant's visit reports	____	____
	-Compliance reports	____	____
	-Minimum program standards	____	____
	-other____________	____	____

X =s YES ? =s UNCLEAR No Response =s Not present in document

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify the effectiveness of the vocational instructor's participation in the implementation of program goals and objectives planned to help the student succeed in a vocational program?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	-students	____	____
	-parents	____	____
	-administrators	____	____
	-vocational faculty	____	____
	-pupil support personnel	____	____
	-program advisory committee	____	____
	-other____________	____	____
Personal interviews with	-students	____	____
	-parents	____	____
	-administrators	____	____
	-vocational faculty	____	____
	-pupil support personnel	____	____
	-program advisory committee	____	____
	-other____________	____	____
Review of student	-records	____	____
	-test scores	____	____
	-drop-out ratios	____	____
	-other____________	____	____
Review of LEA	-1 and 5 year plans	____	____
	-Grant Application (RFP)	____	____
	-End of year program report	____	____
	-other____________	____	____
Review of SEA	-Consultant's visit reports	____	____
	-Compliance reports	____	____
	-Minimum program standards	____	____
	-other____________	____	____

X =s YES ? =s UNCLEAR No Response =s Not present in Document

COMMENTS CONCERNING CONTENT ANALYSIS:

7. Does the SEA evaluate whether the program is having an effect on the participant's performance in his/her vocational education program?

___YES ___NO

IF YES: What SEA evaluation strategy formats are used to determine whether

____LEA Self-evaluation

____External Evaluation Team

____External Evaluation by an "expert"

____Independent Third Party Evaluation

____Evaluation by State Consultant

____other________________________

____using LEA developed instruments

____using SEA developed instruments

____using neither SEA or LEA developed instruments

____other________________________

D =s used in evaluation of disadvantaged programs
H =s used in evaluation of handicapped programs
D/H =s used in evaluation of both programs

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify how the program is having an effect on the participant's performance in his/her vocational education program?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	- students	___	___
	- parents	___	___
	-administrators	___	___
	-vocational faculty	___	___
	-pupil support personnel	___	___
	-program advisory committee	___	___
	-other________________	___	___
Personal Interviews with	-students	___	___
	-parents	___	___
	-administrators	___	___
	-vocational faculty	___	___
	-pupil support personnel	___	___
	-program advisory committee	___	___
	-other________________	___	___
Review of student	-records	___	___
	-test scores	___	___
	-drop-out ratios	___	___
	-other________________	___	___
Review of LEA	-1 and 5 year plans	___	___
	-Grant Application (RFP)	___	___
	-End of year program report	___	___
	-other________________	___	___
Review of SEA	-Consultant's visit reports	___	___
	-Compliance reports	___	___
	-Minimum program standards	___	___
	-other________________	___	___

X =s YES ? =s UNCLEAR No Response =s Not present in document

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify the effectiveness of the LEA program's efforts to effect the participant's performance in his/her vocational education program?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	-students	___	___
	-parents	___	___
	-administrators	___	___
	-vocational faculty	___	___
	-pupil support personnel	___	___
	-program advisory committee	___	___
	-other________________	___	___
Personal interviews with	-students	___	___
	-parents	___	___
	-administrators	___	___
	-vocational faculty	___	___
	-pupil support personnel	___	___
	-program advisory committee	___	___
	-other________________	___	___
Review of student	-records	___	___
	-test scores	___	___
	-drop-out ratios	___	___
	-other________________	___	___
Review of LEA	-1 and 5 year plans	___	___
	-Grant Application (RFP)	___	___
	-End of year program report	___	___
	-other________________	___	___
Review of SEA	-Consultant's visit reports	___	___
	-Compliance reports	___	___
	-Minimum program standards	___	___
	-other________________	___	___

X =s YES ? =s UNCLEAR No Response =s Not present in Document

COMMENTS CONCERNING CONTENT ANALYSIS:

8. Does the SEA evaluate whether people involved in and/or affected by the program believe the instructional offerings available are appropriately matched with identified student unmet needs?

___YES ___NO

IF YES: What SEA evaluation strategy formats are used to determine whether people involved in and/or affected by the program believe the instructional offerings available are appropriately matched with identified student unment needs?

_____LEA Self-evaluation

_____External Evaluation Team

_____External Evaluation by an "expert"

_____Independent Third Party Evaluation

_____Evaluation by State Consultant

_____other_______________________

_____using LEA developed instruments

_____using SEA developed instruments

_____using neither SEA or LEA developed instruments

_____other_______________________

D =s used in evaluation of disadvantaged programs
H =s used in evaluation of handicapped programs
D/H =s used in evaluation of both programs

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify how the instructional offerings available are appropriately matched with identified student unmet needs?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	- students		
	- parents		
	-administrators		
	-vocational faculty		
	-pupil support personnel		
	-program advisory committee		
	-other_______________		
Personal Interviews with	-students		
	-parents		
	-administrators		
	-vocational faculty		
	-pupil support personnel		
	-program advisory committee		
	-other_______________		
Review of student	-records		
	-test scores		
	-drop-out ratios		
	-other_______________		
Review of LEA	-1 and 5 year plans		
	-Grant Application (RFP)		
	-End of year program report		
	-other_______________		
Review of SEA	-Consultant's visit reports		
	-Compliance reports		
	-Minimum program standards		
	-other_______________		

X =s YES ? =s UNCLEAR No Response =s Not present in document

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify the effectiveness of the LEA program to appropriately match instructional offerings available with identified student unmet needs?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	-students		
	-parents		
	-administrators		
	-vocational faculty		
	-pupil support personnel		
	-program advisory committee		
	-other_______________		
Personal interviews with	-students		
	-parents		
	-administrators		
	-vocational faculty		
	-pupil support personnel		
	-program advisory committee		
	-other_______________		
Review of student	-records		
	-test scores		
	-drop-out ratios		
	-other_______________		
Review of LEA	-1 and 5 year plans		
	-Grant Application (RFP)		
	-End of year program report		
	-other_______________		
Review of SEA	-Consultant's visit reports		
	-Compliance reports		
	-Minimum program standards		
	-other_______________		

X =s YES ? =s UNCLEAR No Response =s Not present in Document

COMMENTS CONCERNING CONTENT ANALYSIS:

9. Does the SEA evaluate whether the program has an appropriate teacher/pupil ratio?

___YES ___NO

IF YES: What SEA evaluation strategy formats are used to determine whether the program has an appropriate teacher/pupil ratio?

____LEA Self-evaluation

____External Evaluation Team

____External Evaluation by an "expert"

____Independent Third Party Evaluation

____Evaluation by State Consultant

____other____________________

____using LEA developed instruments

____using SEA developed instruments

____using neither SEA or LEA developed instruments

____other____________________

D =s used in evaluation of disadvantaged programs
H =s used in evaluation of handicapped programs
D/H =s used in evaluation of both programs

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify how the program has determined an appropriate teacher/pupil ratio?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	- students	___	___
	- parents	___	___
	-administrators	___	___
	-vocational faculty	___	___
	-pupil support personnel	___	___
	-program advisory committee	___	___
	-other________	___	___
Personal Interviews with	-students	___	___
	-parents	___	___
	-administrators	___	___
	-vocational faculty	___	___
	-pupil support personnel	___	___
	-program advisory committee	___	___
	-other________	___	___
Review of student	-records	___	___
	-test scores	___	___
	-drop-out ratios	___	___
	-other________	___	___
Review of LEA	-1 and 5 year plans	___	___
	-Grant Application (RFP)	___	___
	-End of year program report	___	___
	-other________	___	___
Review of SEA	-Consultant's visit reports	___	___
	-Compliance reports	___	___
	-Minimum program standards	___	___
	-other________	___	___

X =s YES ? =s UNCLEAR No Response =s Not present in document

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify the effectiveness of the LEA program's teacher/pupil ratio?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	-students	___	___
	-parents	___	___
	-administrators	___	___
	-vocational faculty	___	___
	-pupil support personnel	___	___
	-program advisory committee	___	___
	-other________	___	___
Personal interviews with	-students	___	___
	-parents	___	___
	-administrators	___	___
	-vocational faculty	___	___
	-pupil support personnel	___	___
	-program advisory committee	___	___
	-other________	___	___
Review of student	-records	___	___
	-test scores	___	___
	-drop-out ratios	___	___
	-other________	___	___
Review of LEA	-1 and 5 year plans	___	___
	-Grant Application (RFP)	___	___
	-End of year program report	___	___
	-other________	___	___
Review of SEA	-Consultant's visit reports	___	___
	-Compliance reports	___	___
	-Minimum program standards	___	___
	-other________	___	___

X =s YES ? =s UNCLEAR No Response =s Not present in Document

COMMENTS CONCERNING CONTENT ANALYSIS:

10. Does the SEA evaluate whether the program's instructor(s) has the teacher qualifications to work with handicapped/disadvantaged students?

___YES ___NO

IF YES: What SEA evaluation strategy formats are used to determine whether the teacher has the qualifications to work with handicapped/disadvantaged students?

___LEA Self-evaluation	___using LEA developed instruments
___External Evaluation Team	___using SEA developed instruments
___External Evaluation by an "expert"	___using neither SEA or LEA developed instruments
___Independent Third Party Evaluation	___other___________
___Evaluation by State Consultant	
___other___________	

D =s used in evaluation of disadvantaged programs
H =s used in evaluation of handicapped programs
D/H =s used in evaluation of both programs

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify how the LEA determined that the teacher was qualified to work with handicapped/disadvantaged students?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	- students	___	___
	- parents	___	___
	-administrators	___	___
	-vocational faculty	___	___
	-pupil support personnel	___	___
	-program advisory committee	___	___
	-other___________	___	___
Personal Interviews with	-students	___	___
	-parents	___	___
	-administrators	___	___
	-vocational faculty	___	___
	-pupil support personnel	___	___
	-program advisory committee	___	___
	-other___________	___	___
Review of student	-records	___	___
	-test scores	___	___
	-drop-out ratios	___	___
	-other___________	___	___
Review of LEA	-1 and 5 year plans	___	___
	-Grant Application (RFP)	___	___
	-End of year program report	___	___
	-other___________	___	___
Review of SEA	-Consultant's visit reports	___	___
	-Compliance reports	___	___
	-Minimum program standards	___	___
	-other___________	___	___

X =s YES ? =s UNCLEAR No Response =s Not present in document

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify the effectiveness of the LEA program in determining the qualifications of the teacher to work with handicapped/disadvantaged students?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	-students	___	___
	-parents	___	___
	-administrators	___	___
	-vocational faculty	___	___
	-pupil support personnel	___	___
	-program advisory committee	___	___
	-other___________	___	___
Personal interviews with	-students	___	___
	-parents	___	___
	-administrators	___	___
	-vocational faculty	___	___
	-pupil support personnel	___	___
	-program advisory committee	___	___
	-other___________	___	___
Review of student	-records	___	___
	-test scores	___	___
	-drop-out ratios	___	___
	-other___________	___	___
Review of LEA	-1 and 5 year plans	___	___
	-Grant Application (RFP)	___	___
	-End of year program report	___	___
	-other___________	___	___
Review of SEA	-Consultant's visit reports	___	___
	-Compliance reports	___	___
	-Minimum program standards	___	___
	-other___________	___	___

X =s YES ? =s UNCLEAR No Response =s Not present in Document

COMMENTS CONCERNING CONTENT ANALYSIS:

APPENDIX G

PLANNING AND OPERATIONAL CONTENT ANALYSIS CODE SHEETS

1. Does the SEA evaluate whether LEA program goals and objectives have been implemented as planned?

___YES ___NO

IF YES: What SEA evaluation strategy formats are used to determine whether LEA program goals and objectives have been implemented as planned?

_____LEA Self-evaluation

_____External Evaluation Team

_____External Evaluation by an "expert"

_____Independent Third Party Evaluation

_____Evaluation by State Consultant

_____other_____________________________

_____using LEA developed instruments

_____using SEA developed instruments

_____using neither SEA or LEA developed instruments

_____other_____________________________

D =s used in evaluation of disadvantaged programs
H =s used in evaluation of handicapped programs
D/H =s used in evaluation of both programs

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify how LEA program goals and objectives have been implemented as planned?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	- students	____	____
	- parents	____	____
	-administrators	____	____
	-vocational faculty	____	____
	-pupil support personnel	____	____
	-program advisory committee	____	____
	-other____________	____	____
Personal Interviews with	-students	____	____
	-parents	____	____
	-administrators	____	____
	-vocational faculty	____	____
	-pupil support personnel	____	____
	-program advisory committee	____	____
	-other____________	____	____
Review of student	-records	____	____
	-test scores	____	____
	-drop-out ratios	____	____
	-other____________	____	____
Review of LEA	-1 and 5 year plans	____	____
	-Grant Application (RFP)	____	____
	-End of year program report	____	____
	-other____________	____	____
Review of SEA	-Consultant's visit reports	____	____
	-Compliance reports	____	____
	-Minimum program standards	____	____
	-other____________	____	____

X =s YES ? =s UNCLEAR No Response =s Not present in document

IF YES: What evaluation strategies are used to verify the effectiveness of LEA program implementation of planned goals and objectives?

		Disadvantaged	Handicapped
Written survey of	-students	____	____
	-parents	____	____
	-administrators	____	____
	-vocational faculty	____	____
	-pupil support personnel	____	____
	-program advisory committee	____	____
	-other____________	____	____
Personal interviews with	-students	____	____
	-parents	____	____
	-administrators	____	____
	-vocational faculty	____	____
	-pupil support personnel	____	____
	-program advisory committee	____	____
	-other____________	____	____
Review of student	-records	____	____
	-test scores	____	____
	-drop-out ratios	____	____
	-other____________	____	____
Review of LEA	-1 and 5 year plans	____	____
	-Grant Application (RFP)	____	____
	-End of year program report	____	____
	-other____________	____	____
Review of SEA	-Consultant's visit reports	____	____
	-Compliance reports	____	____
	-Minimum program standards	____	____
	-other____________	____	____

X =s YES ? =s UNCLEAR No Response =s Not present in Document

COMMENTS CONCERNING CONTENT ANALYSIS:

APPENDIX H

CONTENT ANALYSIS INDICATOR SHEET
(Example)

PLANNING PROCESSES

DOCUMENT ANALYSIS FOR

the State of

____

		NO	YES	IF YES, IDENTIFY Page #	 Item #
1.	Does the SEA evaluate whether the LEA has made efforts to identify locally available handicapped/disadvantaged resources and/or services?				
2.	Does the SEA evaluate efforts made by the LEA to utilize locally available handicapped/disadvantaged resources and or services?				
3.	Does the SEA evaluate efforts made by the LEA to identify those students in need of special services or programs in order to succeed in their vocational education program?				
4.	Does the SEA evaluate whether the LEA handicapped/disadvantaged program is serving only those students who are unable to succeed in their vocational education program?				
5.	Does the SEA evaluate whether the LEA Program assesses the unmet needs of each individual program participant prior to providing services?				
6.	Does the SEA evaluate whether individuals knowledgeable about the student (e.g. parents, teachers, special educators) are involved in assessment activities that seek to identify the student's unmet needs prior to the program providing services?				
7.	Does the SEA evaluate whether the unmet needs of an individual student influence the student's program goals and objectives as a participant in the handicapped/disadvantaged program?				
8.	Does the SEA evaluate whether the unmet needs of individual students influence the formation of the LEA program's goals and objectives?				
9.	Does the SEA evaluate whether the student's vocational instructor is involved in the planning which develops goals and objectives for meeting the student's unmet needs?				
0.	Does the SEA evaluate whether individuals knowledgeable about the needs of handicapped/disadvantaged students (e.g. handicapped/disadvantaged workers, advisory committee members) are involved in the planning that influences the formation of the LEA program's goals and objectives?				
11.	Does the SEA evaluate whether the LEA has established timelines for completing major program goals and objectives?				
12.	Does the SEA evaluate whether the LEA has a plan for implementing the program's goals and objectives?				

OPERATIONAL PROCESSES

DOCUMENT ANALYSIS FOR

the State of

____

		NO	YES	IF YES, IDENTIFY Page #	 Item #
1.	Does the SEA evaluate whether LEA program goals and objectives have been implemented as planned?				
2.	Does the SEA evaluate whether people involved in and/or affected by the program are aware of the program's purpose(s)?				
3.	Does the SEA evaluate whether people involved in and/or affected by the program are aware of the services provided by the program?				
4.	Does the SEA evaluate whether people involved in and/or affected by the program are in agreement with the adequacy of instructional resources available for use by the participants?				
5.	Does the SEA evaluate whether the goals and objectives planned to help the student succeed in a vocational program have been implemented by the program as planned?				
6.	Does the SEA evaluate whether the vocational instructor has participated in the implementation of program goals & objectives planned to help the student succeed in a vocational program?				
7.	Does the SEA evaluate whether the program is having an effect on the participant's performance in his/her vocational education program?				
8.	Does the SEA evaluate whether people involved in and/or affected by the program believe the instructional offerings available are appropriately matched with identified student unmet needs?				
9.	Does the SEA evaluate whether the program has an appropriate teacher/pupil ratio?				
10.	Does the SEA evaluate whether the program's instructor(s) has the teacher qualifications to work with handicapped/disadvantaged students?				

APPENDIX I

TELEPHONE INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE
FOR
STATES WITHOUT H/D EVALUATION SYSTEMS

1. Your state does not have a special needs evaluation system: RIGHT?

2. Did you state ever have a special needs evaluation system?

3. Are special needs projects and/or services evaluated within or as part of a larger evaluation system in your state...like an evaluation system for all vocational programs every 5 years?

4. Are you planning to develop a special needs evaluation system or are you in the process of developing one?

IF YES: Who are you working with to develop the evaluation system?

IF YES: Can you give me what you consider to be the purposes for evaluating special needs projects in your state?

____program improvement
____meeting Federal evaluation mandates
____improve program planning
____determine future funding

IF YES: WILL it be part of a larger state evaluation system or separate from it?

APPENDIX J

TELEPHONE INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE
FOR
STATES WITH H/D EVALUATION SYSTEMS

1. Can you please tell me what are the purposes for evaluating special needs projects and services in your state?

_____program improvement
_____meeting Federal evaluation mandates
_____improve program planning
_____determine future funding

2. Do you think that your state system for evaluating special needs projects and services is able to determine the effectiveness of local project planning processes?

(probe: can you give me some examples?)

On a scale of 1 to 5 --- 5 being the highest --- what number value would you give to your state system's ability to determine the effectiveness of local project planning processes?

1 2 3 4 5

3. Do you think that your state system for evaluating special needs projects and services is able to determine the effectiveness of local project operational processes?

(Probe: Can you give me some examples?)

On a scale of 1 to 5 --- 5 being the highest --- what number value would you give to your state system's ability to determine the effectiveness of local project operational processes?

1 2 3 4 5

4. Were there [redacted] any difficulties that you or your state ecountered in developing your special needs evaluation system?

5. Have you encountered any difficulties in implementing your special needs evaluation system?

6. How do you as a state consultant use the results of special needs evaluations?

7. How do you as a state consultant think the local level vocational educators use the results of special needs evaluations?

8. Based on your knowledge as a state consultant, "What has been the reaction of local level personnel to your state evaluation system for special needs projects and services?

9. In reviewing your evaluation document, my judgement is that your special needs evaluation   is   is not   integrated into your state's 5 year evaluation of all vocational programs.   Is that correct?

10. Can you please give me some examples of the types of special needs projects you are evaluating with the instruments you sent me?

WELL, DO YOU HAVE ANYTHING YOU WOULD LIKE TO ADD OR TALK ABOUT THAT WAS NOT INCLUDED IN THE QUESTIONS I HAVE ASKED YOU?

WELL, THANK YOU VERY MUCH

OH, BY THE WAY, BOB WATSON SAID HE WILL BE SENDING YOU A COPY OF THE EVALUATION SYSTEM WE DESIGNED. IT HAS JUST GONE TO THE PRINTERS SO I WOULD THINK YOU WILL HAVE ONE IN AUGUST SOMETIME.